

## CHAPTER III.

## TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE MASS.

THE mass is to Papists the most essential part of their whole system. Here we find the concentration of all Popish error,—the doctrinal error—the gross superstition—the odious buying and selling of holiest things, or things which are represented as holiest—the worldly transacting and trafficking with regard to highest interests—the prostitution of things sacred to meanest purposes—the wilful imposition—the curious subtlety of argument—the judicial delusion and believing of a lie—the systematic accommodation of everything to the aggrandizement of the priesthood,—with whatsoever else is most contrary to Christianity, morality, honour, reason, and common sense.

The mass is the sacrifice of the Popish Church. There can be no priest without a sacrifice. It is this alleged sacrifice upon which the Popish clergy mainly found their claim to be acknowledged as a priesthood. But in order that the mass may be regarded as a sacrifice, the doctrine of transubstantiation is indispensable,—the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper must be regarded as undergoing a change, by which, whilst still remaining to all appearance bread and wine, they become in reality the body and blood,—nay, the body, soul, and divinity (such is the blasphemy) of our Lord Jesus Christ. And in the so called sacrifice of the mass the priest offers the supposed Christ, that is, the wafer and the wine, in sacrifice to God, as a propitiation for the sins of the quick and the dead. All this perfectly accords with the idea of merit in human services, and is as contrary to the doctrine of Christ's righteousness as it is conducive to



the exaltation of the priest by whom the sacrifice is said to be offered.

In Popish catechisms you do not find such a question as What is the Lord's Supper? but you find part of the catechism devoted to the subject of the *Holy Eucharist*, or the *Blessed Eucharist*, and afterwards another portion allotted to the *Sacrifice of the Mass*,—the ordinance being considered first as a sacrament and then as a sacrifice. Papists prefer the name Eucharist, (from the Greek *ευχαριστια*, *thanksgiving*;) evidently because the idea presented by the simple scriptural term Lord's Supper cannot so readily be made to harmonize with the idea of sacrifice. They wish to represent this as a *thanksgiving service*, like those which were under the *Old Law*.<sup>1</sup>

It is thus that Mr Keenan, in his *Controversial Catechism*, states the faith of his Church concerning the *Eucharist*. "That after the words of consecration are pronounced over the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the outward appearances of bread and wine,—the whole substance of the bread being changed into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood; we understand also, not his body and blood as they were in this world, but as they are now, glorious and immortal in heaven."<sup>2</sup>

It is worthy of observation that although this author here speaks of our Lord Jesus Christ, *true God and true man*, being truly, really, and substantially contained under the outward appearances of bread and wine, yet he does not speak of his soul and divinity in the offensive way which those of his Church very generally do, and even the Council of Trent itself. And this caution he maintains to the end in his *Controversial Catechism*, though in his *Catechism of the Christian Religion* he speaks out more fully.<sup>3</sup> The example of such caution had been

<sup>1</sup> "In offering and receiving, &c. . . . we offer to God the most agreeable of all acts of thanksgiving." (Keenan, *Cat. of Chr. Rel.*, II. 27.)

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, *Contr. Cat.*, ch. xxiv., sect. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Cat. of Chr. Rel.*, II., 31.

set him by Dr Milner in his *End of Controversy*, where the question of transubstantiation is so treated that some of the most offensive features of the Popish doctrine are scarcely allowed to appear.

In the Most Rev. Dr James Butler's *Catechism* the question "What is the Blessed Eucharist?" is answered thus—"The body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the appearances of bread and wine."<sup>1</sup> Let the reader carefully compare this with Mr Keenan's definition of the Eucharist above quoted, and he will perceive the difference of the aspect under which Popery chooses to present itself to those whose minds are already wholly under its power, and that in which it wishes to be contemplated by Protestants.

It is curious to observe, not only how Popery adapts itself to Protestant eyes, but to the minds of different classes of persons within its own pale. Dr Lingard, in his *Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrine and Worship of the Catholic Church*, a work evidently intended for a more educated and intelligent class of Papists than Dr James Butler's *Catechism*, answers the question "What is the Holy Eucharist?" merely with these words, "The body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, under the outward appearances of bread and wine."<sup>2</sup>

But Dr Wiseman,<sup>3</sup> in this as in some other things, rejects the example of caution set him by such writers as Milner and Lingard. He openly brings forward the doctrine of his Church after the words of the Council of Trent,<sup>4</sup> and the creed of Pope Pius IV.—of which the seventeenth article is as follows:—"I profess likewise that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the *Eucharist* there is *truly, really, and substantially*, the *body and blood*, together with the *soul and divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body,

<sup>1</sup> Lesson xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> P. 101.

<sup>3</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, &c., II. 136.

<sup>4</sup> *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xiii., c. iv.



and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation."<sup>1</sup> However, Dr Wiseman argues without much reference to anything more than the alleged conversion of the bread into the body, and of the wine into the blood of the Saviour.

Berington and Kirk, after stating the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood, proceed to state their faith in this further proposition:—

"The body of Christ, in this holy sacrament, is not separated from his blood, nor his blood from his body, nor is either of them disjoined from his soul and divinity; but all and the whole living Christ is entirely contained under each species, so that whoever receives under one kind, becomes truly partaker of the whole sacrament; he is not deprived either of the body or of the blood of Christ."<sup>2</sup>

Here, in passing, it may not be unsuitable to quote, as illustrating the grossness of this Popish doctrine, even in respect to the mere flesh and blood, one of Scheffmacher's arguments in favour of communion under one kind, or, in other words, the giving of the bread or wafer alone to the laity. "The *blood*," he says, is really "received under the appearance of the bread." "Why so?" he proceeds. "Because the living and immortal body of Jesus Christ is there, *and a living body is not without blood*."<sup>3</sup> And monstrous as this is, Mr Keenan copies it with little modification.<sup>4</sup>

The Council of Trent itself, with the usual anathemas subjoined, declared that it is most true that as much is contained under either species as under both, for Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread, and under each (divided) particle of that species, and whole under the species of wine, and under its sepa-

<sup>1</sup> As translated in Bishop Challoner's "Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine."

<sup>2</sup> Berington and Kirk, 259.

<sup>3</sup> Scheffmacher, *Cat. de Controv.*, ch. vii., sec. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxv., sect. 1.

rated parts,"<sup>1</sup>—a fair and legitimate extension of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which Popery has not scrupled to carry out, as we shall see, to its legitimate practical consequences; although many of its controversialists, as Mr Keenan in his Catechism, and Dr Milner in his *End of Controversy*, and even Dr Wiseman in his *Lectures*, keep these consequences out of sight.

It is very manifest that the doctrine thus asserted must be fraught with important consequences, in relation both to doctrinal and practical religion. It follows naturally from this doctrine, that, according to the words of the Council of Trent's decree, sanctioned by an anathema, all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of *latria*, which is due to the true God;<sup>2</sup> and thus this doctrinal error involves the Popish Church in one of the most degrading forms of idolatry that ever existed upon earth. It follows from this doctrine also, that the sacramental elements should be regarded as a *host* (*hostia*) or victim offered in sacrifice, and this sacrifice as propitiatory, to the infinite disparagement of Christ's sacrifice of himself, the one offering by which he hath perfected for ever all them that are sanctified.<sup>3</sup> It follows that the ministers of the Popish Church should be regarded as priests, to the disparagement of Christ's glory as the sole priest of the Church which he hath redeemed with his blood,—to the establishment of a monstrous system of priestcraft and delusion, ruining the souls of men. It follows from this doctrine, likewise, that questions necessarily arise which are only calculated to bring all religion into contempt amongst men who know not of a purer and nobler Christianity; such as that grave and much debated question, *Quid comedit mus?* (What eateth the mouse?)—that is to say, *What* is it that a mouse eats in the event of its eating the consecrated host? And it follows that the solemnities of worship and the practice of religion are mixed up with a miserable attention to points such as these, What is to be

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii., c. iii., as translated by Berington and Kirk.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii., c. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. x. 14.



done with any little particles of the elements that may remain unconsumed,—and in what precise manner it is best that the wafer should be received into the mouth, so that it may go down into the stomach without the circumstances of mastication common to ordinary food. We shall see by and bye what rules the Papists of our own age and country receive for their guidance in such matters.

It is not one of the least important or least offensive consequences of the doctrine of transubstantiation, that every receiver of the sacrament, worthy or unworthy, is and must be regarded as receiving Christ, and this in respect of the mere bodily action. Popish writers insist much, it is true, upon preparation for the sacrament: and they are even accustomed, with their usual disregard of all truth, to allege, as an objection to Protestantism, that it dispenses with the necessity of preparation. It consists with their whole scheme to invest the sacrament with a fictitious awfulness and solemnity; and thereby it becomes an instrument for working more effectually upon the hopes and fears of persons who have no idea of the spiritual glory that attends a scene of true communion with God, when the emblems of Christ's broken body and shed blood, employed according to his word, and in connection with his word, become instrumental for the confirmation and increase of faith, and for awakening the soul of the believer to a livelier apprehension of Christ's love, and a more affectionate response of love and gratitude to him,—when the gospel and its promises are sealed anew by God himself, and the soul is bound by a new and more strongly felt engagement to be the Lord's, and hope is animated as believing men shew forth their Saviour's death in expectation of his coming again. But let Popish doctors insist as they may on the necessity of preparation for the sacrament, and on the guilt and danger of unworthy receiving, it still remains a necessary consequence of their own doctrine that every receiver, however unworthy and however wicked, receives Christ—whole Christ—body and blood, soul and divinity, into his mouth and into his stomach. It might seem as if the very absurdity of the notion were sufficient

to confute it, if the fact of its prevalence did not attest the strength of the delusion. It might seem as if its very offensiveness must needs awaken the utmost repugnance and detestation wherever the name of Christ was named; but, alas! Popery has succeeded in reconciling men to things utterly repugnant both to intellect and moral feeling. And thence that fearful reaction which flung Popish France into the abyss of infidelity, beginning from the very period when the triumph of Popery was most complete, and Protestantism had been put down by persecution and in blood. What a contrast betwixt the Popish doctrine in itself and in its consequences, and that presented in our Shorter Catechism, where we are told that "the Lord's Supper is a sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving *bread* and *wine*, according to Christ's appointment, his death is shewed forth, and the *worthy* receivers are, *not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith*, made partakers of his body and blood, with all his benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace!"

Of transubstantiation, as well as purgatory, it has been confessed by not a few Popish divines of high reputation, that it needs for its establishment the interposition of Church authority, and cannot conclusively be made out from the Scriptures alone. Erasmus, Scotus, Bellarmine, Alliaco, Cajetan, Fisher, Biel, Tanner, and Canus, are quoted to this effect.<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Wiseman does not follow them in making such an admission; but ere he can enter upon the hermeneutical inquiries connected with this doctrine, he cannot help uttering his regret at the necessity of so doing,—a hard necessity of hard times. He thinks it would be better for theology if it were free from the admixture of that "perfectly foreign and earthly science, philology." He gives it as his judgment, "that this philological method of learning religion is one of the most pernicious evils we owe to the Reformation, and that far better would it have been, had the plain and only true rule of Church authority con-

<sup>1</sup> Edgar, Variations of Popery, (Lond. 1838,) 362.



tinued in its legitimate force." And again he repeats this, lamenting that his brethren, especially in England and Germany, have so much allowed themselves "to be led by Protestants into a war of detail" concerning particular points, "instead of steadily fixing them to one fundamental discussion, and resolving all compound inquiries into their one simple element—Church authority."<sup>1</sup> However, he expresses great confidence that proper hermeneutical investigations can never be at variance with the decisions of Church authority, or in other words, with the decrees of the Council of Trent.

But when Church authority alone may not suffice, the most essential Scripture argument used by Papists in support of the doctrine of transubstantiation, though not generally first mentioned, is derived from the words of Christ, "This is my body," which they insist that we must understand in a literal sense, utterly discarding all figurative interpretation. This argument the Council of Trent itself has employed, and upon this basis does the Council rest the whole doctrinal superstructure; thus making it a matter of faith for every Papist, that the argument is a good and sound one. "As Christ our Redeemer truly declared that to be his body which he offered under the appearance of bread,"—where it will be observed that the Reverend Fathers do not scruple to put their own interpretation of Christ's words into his mouth instead of the words themselves,—“therefore was it always believed in the Church of God,”—and here the Reverend Fathers run the question of their infallibility up into contact with hard historic fact—“and the same this holy Synod again announces—that, by the consecration of the bread and wine, a change is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood. This change has been properly called, by the holy Catholic Church, transubstantiation.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on the Eucharist*, (Lond. 1851,) 38.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Trid., sess. xiii., c. iv; as translated by Berington and Kirk.

This argument is, of course, prominently put forward by Dr Milner, who endeavours to avail himself at the same time of the authority of antiquity, quoting the following words as from *St Cyril of Jerusalem*:—"Since Christ himself affirms thus of the bread, *This is my body*, who is so daring as to doubt it? And since he affirms, *This is my blood*, who will deny that it is his blood? At Cana of Galilee, he, by an act of his will, turned water into wine, which resembles blood; and is he not then to be credited when he changes wine into blood? Therefore, full of certainty, let us receive *the body and blood of Christ*; for under the form of bread is given to thee his body, and under the form of wine his blood."<sup>1</sup>

But the Popish Bishop is guilty of misrepresenting the author whom he pretends to quote. It is indeed true, that Cyril of Jerusalem, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century, used very florid and exaggerated language respecting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and perhaps no writer so ancient furnishes expressions so easily accommodated to the support of the Popish doctrine. But however far he had departed from primitive simplicity, his language still required alteration to make it all that Dr Milner wanted. He abridged, therefore, as it suited him; and he introduced, as if it had been part of his author's text, his own ridiculous remark concerning wine, that it *resembles blood*. Above all, he omitted to translate the Greek word *ὡς* in the sentence, "Ὡστε, μετὰ πάσης πλήροφορίας, ὡς σαματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνομεν Χριστοῦ," which he renders, "Therefore, full of certainty, let us receive the body and blood of Christ," although he ought to have rendered it, "Therefore, with full assurance, let us partake, *as it were*, of the body and blood of Christ." And to the concluding sentence, likewise, in his quotation, a more spiritual meaning would have been given if the quotation had been only followed out a little farther, even to the end of the sentence, which is,—“that thou mayest partake of the body and blood of Christ, becoming with him joint body

<sup>1</sup> End of Controversy, Letter xxxvii, quoting Catech. Mystagog., 4.



and joint blood—[σύνταμις καὶ σύναιμις],”—whilst τύπος ἄρτου and τύπος οἴνου would scarcely be translated *form of bread* and *form of wine*, unless by one who had a purpose to serve,—the translation *type* or *figure* being obviously the true one.<sup>1</sup> And such (“type or figure”) is, in fact, the translation given by Berington and Kirk, who also complete the sentence, and who, as might be shewn, if it were not to involve us too deeply in this particular part of the subject, quote not a little which tends rather to overthrow than to confirm their own doctrine. But even they omit the important particle ὡς, making Cyril say, “Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ.”<sup>2</sup> And in this Cardinal Wiseman agrees with them, apparently borrowing his quotation from them, in their translation of it.<sup>3</sup>

Dr Lingard, after his definition of the Holy Eucharist,<sup>4</sup> immediately refers for proof to “the express words of our blessed Saviour, who at the Last Supper said of the bread, ‘This is my body,’ and of the wine, ‘This is my blood,’” and in a note he states the controversy thus:—“The Protestant, arguing from the appearance of the elements to the meaning of the words, contends that, as there is no *visible* change in the bread and wine, the words must be taken in some figurative sense: the Catholic, arguing from the literal meaning of the words to the real state of the elements, contends, that as the meaning is obvious and positive, the bread and wine must have undergone some *invisible* change.”<sup>5</sup> The controversy is here, indeed, unfairly stated; but perhaps the Popish argument was never presented in a form more specious. In the first place, however, it is to be observed that Protestants do not argue from the appearance of the elements to the meaning of the words, without respect to the proper use of language and the natural import of the words themselves, which they regard as in no way calcu-

<sup>1</sup> Faber, *Difficulties of Romanism*, (Lond. 1830,) 424, 425.

<sup>2</sup> Berington and Kirk, 220.

<sup>3</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, &c., II. 225.

<sup>4</sup> Already quoted; see p. 189. <sup>5</sup> Lingard, *Cat. Instr.*, 101, 102.

lated to convey to the minds of those who heard them the idea of any such conversion of substance as Papists denominate transubstantiation. In the second place, if we are to discard the evidence of our senses in judging of the nature of the substances which we see, and handle, and taste, or if we must allow this evidence to be overborne, there remains no certainty in human knowledge, and no reasonable confidence in religion, so that the argument by which Popery maintains its most essential doctrine of transubstantiation, paves the way for that extremest scepticism so often found to coexist or to alternate amongst the same people, with the extremest credulity, superstition, and spiritual bondage.

Mr Keenan, in his *Controversial Catechism*, introduces this argument in connection with one presently to be noticed from the sixth chapter of John's Gospel, one upon which modern defenders of Popery seem even more to depend, as they assign it chief prominence; and assuming that in the words recorded in that chapter, our Lord “promised that he would give his body and blood for the spiritual food of his people,” he informs us that we will find this promise fulfilled in the institution of the Lord's Supper, and insists upon the uniformity of language in the different Evangelists, as affording “one of the strongest proofs for the real presence.”—“Because they, at least, knew what Christ meant, by the words *body* and *blood*; and if Christ meant by these merely *bread* and *wine*, some of them, were it only by accident, would have given his *meaning* instead of his words, or at all events, would have given some explanation of them; yet not one of them did so.”<sup>1</sup>

Here, for a moment, we must pause. To say anything on the probability of some one of the Evangelists giving our Lord's *meaning* instead of his words, is unnecessary. For the whole case is mis-stated; and another instance is afforded of the marvellous adroitness with which Popish controversialists contrive to present to the mind something totally different from what

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *Cont. Cat.*, ch. xxiv., sec. 4. The italics in this instance are Mr Keenan's own.



they would be understood to present, like the juggler who dexterously substitutes one thing for another, when the spectator's attention has been drawn aside from his manipulations. Nobody imagines that by the words *body* and *blood*, our Lord meant merely *bread* and *wine*; and it is a disgraceful artifice to state the controversy as if this were the Protestant opinion: the question is not about the meaning of these *words*, but about the application of them, and so about the meaning of the sentences in which they were employed.

The argument from the words of institution is further expanded and enlarged upon by Mr Keenan. He asserts,—but he seems to forget that assertion is not argument,—that the language used by our Saviour, was the most *proper*, *concise*, and *correct* language that could have been used, according to the Popish notion of its import; “we cannot conceive language better chosen:” and on the other hand, that if his meaning was such as Protestants represent it, “the use of such language would be most unwise and inexplicable:”—though here again he contrives to introduce, perhaps less obviously than before, his misrepresentation of the state of the controversy as to the words; framing his questions thus,—“If Christ intended to deliver to mankind his real body and blood. . . .” “If he intended mere bread and wine. . . .” It seems bold in a man to pronounce such a judgment as this,—“The use of such language would be most unwise and inexplicable.” But this is modest in comparison with what follows; and indeed it is marvellous how unshrinkingly, in their prosecution of this argument, Popish authors give their opinion as to what was, or would have been, proper or improper for the Lord. Mr Keenan argues from the circumstances in which the words were spoken. The time was not one, he says, “in which the use of the most obscure and improper figures should be employed” to convey “the most simple and necessary truths.” Here is the assumption, in short, of everything requiring to be proved. In vain does Mr Keenan make much of the circumstance that our Lord was then “teaching his Apostles what they were to teach others,”—“what was

to be believed and practised by the whole world till the latest ages, and upon the belief and practice of which all were to be saved or damned.” Here, however, it is pretty plain that he denies the possibility of salvation to all those who deny the doctrine of transubstantiation,—like a dutiful son of the Church, cordially accepting the Council of Trent's oft-repeated anathema, and superior to that false liberality, which sometimes betrays modern Papists into the error of speaking of Protestants as their brethren, and their dear fellow Christians. And here again, it is to be observed, that the truth of the Popish doctrine is assumed, in order to argue in favour of it: it is employed in the first place to invest the scene with a peculiar awfulness, and thence again a new argument is drawn for its support; which method of argument, though ancient, is so used that some credit may be allowed for ingenuity. “The awfulness of the time, therefore,” Mr Keenan goes on,—“the awful nature of the doctrine,”—the argument being both *from* this doctrine, and *for* it,—“and its awful importance to those who were to teach, as well as to those who should be taught, all demanded from a good and wise God,”—and let us mark how reverently this author speaks of what is becoming for God,—“what he could easily give, and what he most assuredly did give,—the utmost perspicuity in the language used.”<sup>1</sup>

Whatever force there is in this reasoning, it is evidently founded upon a principle of very sweeping application, that a good and wise God must needs employ such language in his communications with men as shall prevent the possibility of misconception or error. But this is, after all, to turn aside to a different question from that of the natural and proper interpretation of the words actually used; and they who suffer themselves to be drawn aside may find, when they come back, that things are scarcely as they left them. The object of so much being said on this new collateral question, evidently is to make it be supposed that our Lord's words, according to the Protestant

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 4.



interpretation of them, are *unperspicuous*. This very clearly appears from consideration of the following question and answer of Mr Keenan's Catechism:—

"If in this most dignified of all the sacraments" [where we have the assumption of the Popish doctrine, with the same purpose as before] "the true body and blood of Christ were not present, what would be the consequence? That Jesus Christ, the *all wise God and Saviour* of mankind, did intentionally, or at least indifferent as to the awful consequences, express himself so in its institution, as to deceive nineteen-twentieths of those he came to *redeem*,—to involve all Christians in bitter and endless disputes, and expose the great body of his Church to be guilty of the appalling crime of idolatry; all this, too, whilst one word of explanation from him would have prevented all these evils."<sup>1</sup>

And here again is the principle implied in all this reasoning, that God must needs reveal himself so clearly as to prevent mistakes and perversions on the part of men. But even if there were any need of explanation, who shall dare to pronounce upon the circumstances in which it ought to be granted? or who shall tell how it might be received? The Bible speaks of a strong delusion. And perhaps the case may be parallel to that of which we read in Luke xvi., 31. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

Mr Keenan gives great prominence to Dr Adam Clarke's statement that in the Syriac language, the language most probably used by our Lord, there is no word that expresses to signify or represent, and that our Lord therefore almost necessarily used the form of words, *This is my body*. But even if Clarke's statement were as erroneous as Mr Keenan or Dr Wiseman would have it to be, and Dr Wiseman's refutation of it as triumphant as he himself is careful to inform us that it is, yet these Popish controversialists make too much of it.<sup>2</sup>

A bad argument indeed does harm to a good cause; but to hold it up to view as if it were a chief argument where it never

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv, sect. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, &c., II., 191-197, and Lectures on the Eucharist, 253, &c.

was more than a most subordinate one, is one of the poorest tricks of an unfair antagonist, who labours to promote error by appropriate means.

Dr Clarke was sometimes very fanciful in questions of philology; but there is nothing fanciful in the following argument, from the common idiom of all languages:—"Suppose a man entering a museum, enriched with the remains of ancient Greek sculpture; his eyes are attracted by a number of curious busts, and on enquiring what they are, he learns, this is Socrates, that Plato, &c. Is he deceived by this information? . . . . When, therefore, Christ took up a piece of bread, brake it, and said, '*This is my body*,' who but the most stupid of mortals could imagine that he was, at the same time, handling and breaking his own body?"<sup>1</sup>

But here we are met with declamations about the audacity of directly opposing the Lord's own word, a style of argument not unfrequently adopted by those for whom neither hermeneutics nor Church authority can easily be made available. The Popish argument consists mainly in repeating over and over again the words, as if in hope that mere sound will at last prevail. "I own," says Cardinal Wiseman, "that to construct an argument on these words is more difficult than it was on the sixth chapter of St John; simply and solely for this reason, that it is impossible to add strength or clearness to the expressions themselves."<sup>2</sup> There are just two views which can be taken of the argument from the words of institution. It is either incontrovertibly powerful, or ridiculously weak. How much in earnest Papists are in using it many a pile of faggots has testified, promoting that unanimity of which Mr Keenan boasts, when he says that "in addition to the simplicity and perspicuity of the words, we have them explained in the simple and natural sense by the whole Christian Church of all ages and nations, from the time they were uttered to the present day, with the bare exception of

<sup>1</sup> Clarke; quoted by M'Gavin, Protestant, No. lv.

<sup>2</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 174.



a handful of Protestants, who have appeared in a few nations during the last 300 years"!!!<sup>1</sup>

It has been usual with Protestants to oppose the Popish argument from the alleged literal meaning of the words of institution in the sacrament of the supper, by reference to other instances in which our Lord used similar modes of speech, with undoubtedly figurative import—as when he said, "I am the door,"<sup>2</sup> "I am the vine,"<sup>3</sup>—and to the many instances in which the inspired writers express themselves in the same way, as Paul, saying, "That rock was Christ."<sup>4</sup>

To this Mr Keenan undertakes to reply. "May not these words, '*This is my body*,' &c., be understood as these others, '*I am the door*,' '*I am the vine*?'—No, for many reasons."<sup>5</sup> And the reasons immediately follow:—

"1st, Nothing was previously said by Christ to prepare the apostles for believing that he was really to become a vine or a door; whilst he wrought a tremendous miracle, and addressed them in a long discourse, to prepare them to believe that the bread he was to give them should be his own flesh."

The first reason, then, is nothing else than the usual Popish misinterpretation of the sixth chapter of John's gospel. It is curious to see how one error leans and props itself upon another,

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 31.

There is a curious argument in favour of this interpretation and of the doctrine of transubstantiation, from what is called the *Discipline of the Secret*—"the *secrecy* with which the early Christians celebrated the divine mysteries." The main use of this argument seems to be, to make the argument from tradition pass current without very much tradition of the earlier times to rest upon. "It was customary," says Fleury, "to keep the Sacraments concealed, not only from the unbelievers, but also from the catechumens; and they not only did not celebrate them in their presence, but they dared not even to relate to them what passed in them, nor speak even of the nature of the Sacrament. They wrote still less about them; and if, in a public discourse, or in a writing which might fall into profane hands, they were obliged to speak of the Eucharist, or of some other mystery, they did it in obscure and enigmatical terms." (Berington and Kirk, 179.)

<sup>2</sup> John x. 6.

<sup>3</sup> John xv. 1 and 5.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. x. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv. sect. 6.

and how the most gratuitous and preposterous assumptions, with regard to the meaning of one passage of Scripture, are gravely made the grounds of judgment as to the interpretation of other passages. The second reason is no better than the first:—

"When Christ says '*I am the door*,' John x., the Scripture itself, ver. 6, declares that he was speaking figuratively. '*This PROVERB Jesus spoke to them, but they understood not.*' Christ, seeing this, immediately explains the figure: '*I am the door into the sheepfold; by my doctrine and through my blood all must enter. If any man enter in, he shall be saved. I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep.*'"

Granting that the Scripture itself declares that Christ was speaking figuratively, calling that which he had spoken a *proverb* or a *parable*, it does not appear that Christ himself called it so, or that there was anything said at the time to prevent the hearers from interpreting the words literally, except that common sense which Papists would have us to discard. Moreover, the evangelist seems to mention it as a thing for which the disciples were to be blamed, that they were so obtuse, and did not understand at the very first the parable spoken by Jesus. But it is perhaps more important to observe how incorrectly Mr Keenan's argument is based and framed. Any one, reading his words, would imagine that our Lord had already said "*I am the door*," and that this was the very thing to which the evangelist's remark had reference in the sixth verse, "*This parable spake Jesus unto them, but they understood not what things they were which he spake unto them.*" But the reader may easily satisfy himself by turning to his Bible, that the words "*I am the door*" were not used except in that explanation of the original parable, which Mr Keenan would make us regard as an *explanation of these words themselves*. Such is the fairness with which he conducts his argument! And further, instead of giving our Lord's words, as might have been expected, where he says, "Christ immediately explains the figure," he puts into our Lord's mouth his own gloss or paraphrase of his words; and the paraphrase is so framed as to be very favourable to his argument, making it appear that our Lord really gave an expla-



nation of the figure. "I am the door into the sheepfold; *by my doctrine and through my blood* all must enter." But our Lord said nothing of his doctrine and his blood. And some things further he did say, carrying out the original figure, which Mr Keenan finds it convenient to put out of sight; for example, (and it may be as well to quote from the Rhemish Testament,) "I am the door. By me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved; and shall go in and go out, and shall find pastures."<sup>1</sup>

The remainder of this second reason of Mr Keenan, for not understanding the words, "This is my body," in the same way with the undoubtedly figurative expressions of Scripture, is a similar dealing with the words, "I am the vine," in John xv. But it is not necessary to pursue the examination of it in the same way. We have seen enough to prove the value of the argument, and to illustrate Popish controversial art. It is curious and painful to follow these turnings and windings. But the mind by and bye becomes affected with a constant suspiciousness, and looks to find some new unfairness hid in every corner.

Dr Wiseman's Lectures, both his Lent Lectures of 1836 and his Lectures on the Eucharist, contain an elaborate examination of the Protestant argument from similar figurative expressions. He is at great pains to discriminate the passages which contain these expressions into classes, affecting to think that the cause of truth has suffered by their being cast together in a promiscuous heap. The incongruity of the passages is not, however, so obvious. The Cardinal occupies himself in shewing that they are not parallel passages to those which contain the words of institution of the Lord's Supper. But here he spends much learned labour in vain—as of course nobody ever supposed that they were parallel passages, according to the import of the matter contained in them, or in any other respect than as they exemplify a similar figurative mode of expression. It would swell out this volume to an enormous size to enter upon an examination of all the passages adduced, or of all the hermeneutical

<sup>1</sup> John x. 9.

principles which Dr Wiseman makes a great parade of establishing and applying; but it is a very simple principle that warrants us in taking notice of a similarity of construction or phraseology, even in two sentences of signification most diverse; nor can we have great difficulty in reasoning from such words as "I am the door," "I am the vine," to the possibility of a figurative meaning in another sentence of like positive affirmation, such as, "This is my body," whilst yet we do not feel ourselves shut up to the renunciation of all literal interpretation in respect of all sentences so constructed. It is in vain then that Dr Wiseman lays hold of the sentence "The Word was God," and compares it with the sentences in question, though he has adroitly selected a sentence whose signification is also of great importance in another theological controversy. In this latter case, the supposition of a figurative meaning is inadmissible, for there is nothing which can serve us as a figure or representation. This, therefore, is a mere captious argument. But how arbitrary are Dr Wiseman's hermeneutical principles, may be understood from the following sentences:—

"If I desire to illustrate the phrase (Gen. xli. 26) 'The seven good kine are seven years,' by Matt. xiii. 38, 'The field is the world,' or both these by Gal. iv. 24, 'For these are the two covenants,' I am fully justified in doing so, and in considering the passages as perfectly parallel, because the context in all three demonstrates to me that the same thing exists in all; namely, the explanation of a symbolical instruction, in one instance a vision, in another a parable, in the third an allegory. But then it follows, likewise, that in order to thrust the words 'This is my body,' into the same category, and treat them as parallel, we must shew them to contain the same *thing* (which every single instance in the first class of texts does shew)—the explanation of a symbolical instruction. Till this be done, there is no parallelism established."<sup>1</sup>

"In plain English," says Dr Turton, "first prove your point, and then have recourse to your arguments; first shew that the words of institution are to be understood figuratively, and then give your instances, as indications that they *may* be so understood. . . . Whether the perplexity of thought in the preceding

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on Eucharist, 189, 190.



paragraph is voluntary or involuntary, I know not. It would be thought strange in most writers; but, for some reason, it does not seem extraordinary in Dr Wiseman."<sup>1</sup>

Without attempting an examination of Dr Wiseman's four classes of texts, it may suffice to look at his treatment of one text, "I am the door," which is curiously different from Mr Keenan's. This, he says, belongs to a class of texts which have nothing at all to do with the subject,—

"For the verb *to be* does not signify in them *to represent*, and we must consider only those to the purpose in which it does mean *to represent*. . . . Substitute the latter verb; for if the two be equivalent the one must fit in the other's place. . . . 'I am the door,' I *represent* the door—that is not Christ's meaning. 'I am *as* the door, I resemble the door,' that was what he wished to express."<sup>2</sup>

But is not this absolute trifling? The proposition "I am the door," surely warrants the proposition, *The door is Christ*,—and what does this signify but that the door *represents* Christ?

But it is capable of being conclusively and incontrovertibly shewn that Papists do not even interpret the words strictly and literally, upon whose strict and literal interpretation they insist so much. This argument is admirably stated by Stillingfleet:—"If these words be literally and strictly understood, they must make the substance of the bread to be Christ's body, for that is unavoidably the literal sense of the words. For can any man take 'this' to be anything but 'this bread,' who attends to the common sense and meaning of words, and the strict rules of interpretation? Yet this sense will by no means be allowed; for then all that can be inferred from these words is, that when Christ spake these words, the bread was his body. But either Christ meant the bread by 'this,' or he did not; if he did, the former proposition is unavoidable in the literal sense; if he did not, then, by virtue of these words, the bread could never be

turned into the body of Christ: for that only could be made the body of Christ which was meant when Christ said 'This is my body.'"<sup>1</sup> That is, that if our Lord meant by the word 'this,' the bread which he held in his hand, it follows, according to a strict and literal interpretation, that he made a mere affirmation concerning it, to wit, that it, the very substance of it, was his body. And the Papists themselves hold, that when he began to speak the substance was still bread. The sentence thus interpreted, according to the strictest rules of grammar and in the most literal way, becomes the affirmation of an absurdity even if possible more monstrous than transubstantiation itself. But it is to this and not to transubstantiation that the Popish principle of interpretation fairly conducts. Or, as Dr Cunningham states the argument in his notes to Stillingfleet, "the Popish doctrine requires that Christ's words, 'This is my body,' be understood to mean, 'This is changed into my body,' whereas Protestants commonly understand them as meaning, 'This represents my body,'—a smaller departure from the literal meaning, and much more in accordance with the principles that must be applied to the interpretation of many other scriptural statements."<sup>2</sup> And this argument may receive a not inappropriate illustration by quotation of a few words from Milner's *End of Controversy*. Speaking of the differences of opinion amongst Protestants as to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, this author says, "In short, you may say anything you please concerning the Eucharist, without obloquy or inconvenience to yourself, except what the words of Christ, '*This is my body*,' so clearly imply, namely, that *he changes the bread into his body*."<sup>3</sup> Perhaps this may not be an improper place to notice an argument which Dr Milner immediately proceeds to use, adopting it in his next sentence in the words of Bossuet:—"In fact, as the Bishop of Meaux observes, 'the declarations of Christ operate what they express; when he speaks, nature obeys, and he does what he

<sup>1</sup> Stillingfleet, *Doct. and Pract.*, 112.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

<sup>3</sup> Milner, *End of Controversy*, Letter xxxvi.

<sup>1</sup> Turton's *Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist* considered in reply to Dr Wiseman's argument from Scripture, (Cambridge, 1837,) 267.

<sup>2</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, II. 180.



says; thus he cured the ruler's son by saying to him, *Thy son liveth*, and the crooked woman, by saying, *Thou art loosed* from thine infirmity.' " The argument from omnipotence will fall to be noticed hereafter; but, in the meantime, it ought to be observed, that the instances cited are not at all parallel as to the use of language. When our Lord said, *Thy son liveth*,<sup>1</sup> the proposition, literally and strictly taken, was unquestionably true. Nor, if we understand it in reference to the health of the boy, and even suppose that at the very time of the utterance of these words a favourable change was effected, does the case amount to anything more than a mere substitution of the present for the future. The other instance is even less to the purpose; the verb of the sentence is a totally different one, "*Thou art loosed* from thine infirmity." The case would have been parallel if our Lord had said "*This is changed* into my body."

The exposure of the weakness of the Popish argument from the necessity of literal interpretation has been carried farther also in regard to the words "*This is my blood*," and, "*This cup is the New Testament in my blood*." But upon this it seems unnecessary to dwell.

Perhaps one of the weakest arguments ever adduced in support of transubstantiation or any other error, is one which may be found in Dr Milner's *End of Controversy*,—where, referring to the words of the Church of England Catechism, "*The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper*," and the denial in the same Catechism that the elements are ever aught but mere bread and wine, he says, "*This involves an evident contradiction; it is saying, you receive that in the Sacrament which does not exist in the Sacrament*."<sup>2</sup> And hereupon he essays to become ocular. But all this proceeds upon the assumption that there can be no real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, unless it be in the elements, or in a carnal and material way, and so as to be the same to

<sup>1</sup> John iv. 50.<sup>2</sup> Milner, *End of Controversy*, Letter xxxvii.

believer and unbeliever, to worthy and unworthy communicant. And it may here be observed that this assumption is commonly made by Popish controversialists, who confound, and, it would often seem, intentionally, the question of the real presence with that of transubstantiation. And this enables them to secure an important advantage in appearing as the defenders of an important truth at the very outset, though their adversaries be those who never disputed that truth, but have always maintained it and held it precious. To do Mr Keenan justice, however, he goes more boldly to work, and has not recourse to this trick. But Dr Milner avails himself of it in the most ingenious way, and gravely tells us, that "*Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza, and the defenders of the figurative sense in general, all except the Protestants of England, have expressly confessed that, admitting the real presence, the Catholic doctrine is far more conformable to Scripture than the Lutheran*;"<sup>1</sup> from which it might be inferred that they denied the real presence, whereas it was only a certain mode of the real presence that they denied in their controversies either with Lutherans or with Papists.

But if Papists could succeed in making out a real presence of Christ in the Sacrament such as they insist for, what would it avail? What did the real presence of Christ avail the unbelieving Jews, or what did his mere bodily presence, apart from all consideration of his words and deeds, avail even his disciples? It was not the looking upon him with the bodily eye which saved them. Papists have often been reproached with the excessive grossness of the idea which they attach to the Scriptural expressions *feeding upon Christ*,<sup>2</sup> and *eating his flesh and drinking his blood*, when they argue from these in favour of transubstantiation. It is curious, however, how they contrive to shuffle about betwixt the material and the spiritual. Perhaps no more curious instance of this was ever presented, and none which better illustrates transubstantiation and Popery than one which occurs in Milner's *End of Controversy*:—

<sup>1</sup> *End of Controversy*, Letter xxxvi.<sup>2</sup> "*τρώγων με*"; John vi., 57.



"The same tender love which made him shroud the rays of his divinity, and take upon himself the form of a servant and the likeness of man, in his incarnation,—which made him become as a worm and not a man, the reproach of men and the outcast of the people, in his immolation on Mount Calvary, has caused him to descend a step lower, and to conceal his human nature also under the veils of our ordinary nourishment, that thus we may be able to salute him with our mouths and lodge him in our breasts, in order that we may thus, each one of us, abide in him and he abide in us, for the life of our souls."<sup>1</sup>

To salute him with our *mouths*, and lodge him in our *breasts*! As if this were what were done! As if swallowing were saluting! As if what was thus saluted were therefore lodged in the *breast*! But it would have been too gross to have said *stomach*; and the spiritual turn given to the sentence in the next words would have been too incongruous. And so Dr Milner preferred to make a transition from the mouth and stomach to the breast, and thereby essayed to pass from the carnal to the spiritual.

Is it in a literal sense, in all its literal and horrible grossness, that the following prayer from the Canon of the Mass is to be understood?

"May Thy body, O Lord, which I have received, and Thy blood which I have drank, cleave to my bowels; and grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, who have been fed with this pure and holy Sacrament."<sup>2</sup>

It must be taken literally, as the word *mouth* must be taken in the prayer immediately preceding.

With the argument from the alleged literal meaning of the words of Christ, the advocates of transubstantiation usually conjoin an argument from God's omnipotency. This, however, is an argument of an extraordinary form. He can do it, therefore it is done! For this is the form of the argument, whenever the reference to omnipotency is used for another purpose than merely to repel an objection. "Now, I know that Protestants allow God's omnipotency," says the author of a little Popish work recently

<sup>1</sup> Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Key of Heaven, 136.

republished for the Catholic Book Society, "that is, they allow that God has the power of doing all things irresistibly; and let me ask them, what can resist or check God from doing that with a body which is above the nature of a body to do?"<sup>1</sup> And so on.—Mr Keenan uses this argument, and clothes it in that style for which his writings are remarkable. He quotes what we are told in Scripture concerning the Jews: "They strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" And then he breaks out thus:—

"This is exactly the question put, at the present day, by unbelieving Protestants. How?! What blasphemy to put such a question to the Almighty! How did he create the world out of nothing? How did he turn the rod of Moses into a serpent? How did he change the waters into blood? How, the water into wine at Cana? How feed five thousand people with five loaves?"<sup>2</sup>

But the real resemblance to the Jews is to be found in a grossness of conception like theirs, who thought only of an actual eating with their very mouths and teeth.<sup>3</sup>—This is one of Gothe's arguments, as quoted and answered by Stillingfleet. "He believes Christ, being equal to his Father in truth and omnipotency, can make his words good.' We do not in the least dispute Christ's omnipotency," says Stillingfleet, "but we may their familiar way of making use of it to help them out, when sense and reason fail them."<sup>4</sup>

In truth, the question is not one having anything to do with omnipotency. There is no dispute about the power of Christ to change the substance of bread into some other substance, as he changed the water into wine at Cana, or as the waters of Egypt were changed into blood. The question is whether such a change is made. And finding no evidence of it in Christ's

<sup>1</sup> Old Fashion Farmer, 69.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 3. See also Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 31.

<sup>3</sup> "If they [the Jews] were right in taking our Saviour's words literally, we also are right,—if they were wrong in taking them literally, then we also are wrong." (Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 157.)

<sup>4</sup> Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract., 113.



words of institution, or in any other words of Scripture, we find as little elsewhere. Nay, we find clear and positive evidence against it. For, waiving the other Scriptural evidence, and the coherency of the Christian system, of which the doctrine of transubstantiation can never be made a harmonious integral part, we have only to exercise our senses, and they presently testify to us that the bread is still bread.

But here Papists exert all their ingenuity to persuade men that the testimony of their senses is to be utterly set aside in this matter, and the senses and reason to be submitted "to Christ's words," as Gother's expression is, "in the obsequiousness of faith." "What!" exclaims Stillingfleet, "whether we know this to be the meaning of Christ's words or not?"<sup>1</sup>

Papists of necessity admit the appearance to be the same after consecration as before. The bread and wine still appear to be bread and wine. But their subtlest invention is here. The *substance*, they say, is changed, the *accidents* remain as they were; and we know nothing of the *substance* of things—our senses only inform us of their *accidents*. The following extract from a little book, which has already been quoted, will show the way in which this argument is framed:—

"Now, I say, if you would but reflect seriously on this our faith, you might easily see that transubstantiation is not contrary to sense, for none of our senses are contradicted by it. Our senses only perceive the outward appearance of objects, and our understanding only can judge of the inward substance, for the naked substance of any body cannot be perceived by any sense, because it neither has dimension, figure, or colour, nor any of those modifications which affect our senses, and this the great philosopher says, when in treating of bodies he distinguishes in them these two things,—first, the accidents, such as quality, colour, smell, taste, and such like, which are the objects of our senses,—second, the substance, which is clothed (as it were) with the visible and sensible accidents, but is itself invisible, and the object of our understanding and not of our senses."<sup>2</sup>

And then the author goes on to say that it would be to believe things contrary to our senses, if, when we saw the Sacra-

<sup>1</sup> Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract., 113.

<sup>2</sup> Old Fashion Farmer, 64, 65.

ment to be white, we yet believed it to be black—if, when we felt it to be rough, we yet believed it to be smooth—if, when we tasted it to be sweet, we yet believed it to be bitter.

The slightest application of common sense should enable a man to clear his way at once from amidst this metaphysical mystification. It is not to suit the purposes of honest controversy, and of a candid inquiry after truth, that an attempt is thus made to carry the argument into the regions of most refined and abstruse speculation. But we may safely follow even there, as far as human knowledge and human speculation can really go. We may meet our antagonists on their own chosen ground. Men's understandings are befooled, when they are made to admit the possibility of a substance being "clothed" with other accidents than those which are really and properly its own. It is merely the deceitfulness of Popery which is exhibited,—the "deceivableness of unrighteousness," of which the Apostle speaks,—when we are told that "transubstantiation is not a sensible change; that is, that nothing that is sensible in either the bread or wine is changed,"<sup>1</sup> and yet, on the ground of the distinction between substance and accidents are called to believe in a real essential change. A few words more from the book just quoted, may perhaps not be out of place for further illustration.

"But perhaps you will say, that after consecration we see the substance of bread, and yet believe the substance is not there, and is this not contradicting the senses? And I grant that after consecration we see the substance as plain as we did before, but it is absolutely false that any man ever saw the substance of bread either before or after consecration, for, as I said before, he can see no more than the outward accidents, or appearances of bread, and this, we allow, remains the same after consecration as before, so that the senses are not at all deceived."<sup>2</sup>

In like manner, Mr Keenan, asking the question, "Are not the senses deceived in this matter?" replies,

"Not at all; the senses can only be employed on external qualities; they are not exercised on substance. In the Sacrament, the external ap-

<sup>1</sup> Old Fashion Farmer, 66.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.



pearances are those of bread and wine; the senses perceive these, and, therefore, they perceive all that is within their province. As well might you say, the senses were deceived in Christ, who was God-man, and yet appeared to be only man, or in the Holy Ghost, when he appeared under the form of a dove."<sup>1</sup>

No Papist, holding, as he must, the doctrine of transubstantiation, can avoid making use of this distinction betwixt the substance and the accidents. But it is remarkable how Dr Milner, in his *End of Controversy*, refrains from bringing it into prominence,<sup>2</sup> and even in that part of his work which is devoted to the answering of objections, prefers tacitly to assume it without plainly stating it. He makes amends, however, by insisting upon the incompetency of the evidence of our senses to give us sure and satisfactory information of things; thus making use of an argument which leads plainly and directly to universal scepticism, philosophical as well as theological, involving all things of heaven and earth in one cloud of dark and horrid uncertainty:—

"The objections, however," he says, "which you, Rev. Sir, and Bishop Porteus, chiefly insist upon, are the testimony of your senses. You both say, the bread and wine are seen, and touched, and tasted in our Sacrament, the same as in yours. 'If we cannot believe our senses,' the Bishop says, 'we can believe nothing.' This was a good popular topic for Archbishop Tillotson, from whom it is borrowed, to flourish upon in the pulpit; but it will not stand the test of Christian theology. It would undermine the Incarnation itself. With equal reason the Jews said of Christ, '*Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary?*' Mat. xiii., 55. Hence they concluded that he was not what he proclaimed himself to be, the Son of God. In like manner, Joshua thought he saw a man, Joshua v. 13; and Jacob, that he touched one, Gen. xxxii., 24; and Abraham, that he eat with three men, Gen. xviii., 8, when in all these instances there were no real men, but embodied spirits present; the different senses of the patriarchs misleading them. Again, were not *the eyes of the disciples going to Emmaus held so that they should not know Jesus?* Luke xxiv. 16. Did not the same thing happen to Mary Magdalene and the Apostles? John xx., 15. But independently of Scripture, philosophy and experience shew that there is no essential connection between our

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxiv., sect. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Dr Wiseman, also, very much overlooks this part of his subject.

sensations and the objects which occasion them, and that in fact, each of our senses frequently deceives us. How unreasonable then, is it, as well as impious, to oppose their fallible testimony to God's infallible word!"<sup>1</sup>

This passage has been given thus at length, as containing in a pretty condensed form, a number of the common Popish arguments, which other controversialists present with unimportant variations. But the essence of the whole, the great argument to which the references to the Incarnation, the visions of angels, and so forth, are merely subsidiary, is the incompetency or fallibility of the evidence of our senses; an argument which is manifestly open to this objection, "If we cannot believe our senses, we can believe nothing." And this, however a Popish divine may speak of it after a manner which peculiarly distinguishes Popish divines, (and in which they seem to improve, for Mr Keenan greatly excels Dr Milner,) as merely a topic *to flourish upon in the pulpit*, is sober, logical, and hard argument, not to be set aside by a contemptuous and sneering observation.

Perhaps it may be proper, in order that the fullest justice may be done to the Popish side of the question, to present Dr Milner's note on the point of "philosophy and experience," appended to the paragraph just quoted.

"For example," he says, "we think we see the setting sun in a line with our eyes; but philosophy demonstrates that a large portion of the terraqueous globe is interposed between them, and that the sun is considerably below the horizon. As we trust more to our feeling than any other sense; let any person cause his neighbour to shut his eyes, and crossing the two fingers of either hand, make him rub a pea, or any other round substance between them, he will then protest that he feels two objects."<sup>2</sup>

As well might men reason against all confidence in the ordinary occurrences of life, because of the success with which they are sometimes imposed upon by those who assume the name of conjurors and practise tricks of sleight of hand. And it is to be observed, that in all these cases, it is not the senses which deceive or are deceived, but the mind mistakes their testimony, and draws from it undue conclusions.

<sup>1</sup> Milner, *End of Controversy*, Letter xxxviii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*



As to the appearance of our Lord to the disciples on their way to Emmaus, there is no evidence that their senses deceived them in the least, or represented him to their minds in any other lineaments than were really his. That they did not recognise him is otherwise to be accounted for. Recognition is not a thing belonging to the senses at all. As to the men who appeared to Joshua and to Abraham, they were no real men but embodied spirits, and the case is quite different from that of a body which cannot be supposed to exist without certain distinctive natural properties not wholly unknown to us, as most of the natural properties of these embodied spirits are. And perhaps it may be equally proper to reply by questioning the assumption that the senses of Abraham and Joshua deceived them as to the reality of the bodies. As to any thing further, their senses could give no testimony. And nothing further is to the present purpose.

And then as to the Incarnation, Dr Milner's argument, which is a common Popish argument, is a pitiful sophism. Christ's body was a real body, and the senses of men could inform them of nothing more. Our senses do not inform us of the existence even of the souls of men within their bodies. The argument is so far from being of any value in support of transubstantiation, that when the subject is properly considered, it suggests a strong argument against it. How, on the ground assumed by Popish controversialists, could we reply to the Docetae, who denied the reality of the human body of Christ, if such a sect were again to spring up amongst us?

And as to the Holy Ghost appearing in the form of a dove, the answer is much the same as to the argument from the *men* that appeared to Joshua and to Abraham. To believe this is a very different thing from believing that the bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Supper are changed without change of appearances into the body and blood of Christ,—one bodily substance being substituted for another, renouncing its own qualities, and assuming the qualities of that into whose place it comes.

But there is no end to the ingenious refinements of Popish sophistry. Does it seem plain enough that the body of Christ can never exist under the appearance of bread, or with the qualities of bread? We are told to beware; for we know not enough about glorified bodies to warrant us in forming or uttering opinions! We are reminded that it is the glorified body of Christ which is in question, and not an ordinary human body. So speaks the "Old Fashion Farmer:"

"Observe this also, that we do not apprehend Christ's body to be in the Sacrament after that gross, carnal, and corporeal manner as when he was living upon earth, (as you vainly think we do,) but in his incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual being; therefore our belief of transubstantiation does not contradict the senses, by reason of the senses not being proper judges of things above or beyond their reach; for how can a sensible being judge of things insensible?"<sup>1</sup>

In like manner, Mr Keenan says, "We know little of glorified bodies or their qualities and perfections," and uses this as an argument to persuade us that the body of Christ may be in many places at one and the same time.<sup>2</sup>

But it naturally occurs to enquire what took place at the first institution of the Sacrament of the Supper, on that very occasion when our Lord used the words, "This is my body." The argument has been strongly urged by many Protestant writers, of the absurdity of supposing that which our Lord held in his hand to have been his body. His body was there in its own proper form and *accidents*, before the eyes of his disciples; the bread was also there, he held it in his hand. Was this his body or was that? Moreover, the body of Christ was not then glorified. It was still a natural body, similar to our own bodies as they are in the present state of existence.

Besides, as Stillingfleet unanswerably argues, "Christ did himself appeal to the judgment of his disciples' senses concerning the truth of his own body after the resurrection: 'Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see;

<sup>1</sup> Old Fashion Farmer, 65.

Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 7.



for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."<sup>1</sup> Now we think we have reason to allow the same criterion which Christ himself did about the very same body, unless he had then told his disciples that there was to be another supernatural manner of existence of the same body, concerning which their senses were not to be judges."<sup>2</sup>

But Papists, undeterred by the manifest absurdity, do not scruple to declare the whole body to be present in every place where the Sacrament is dispensed—in every Sacrament, nay, in the bread and in the cup—nay, in every individual part of the bread or of the wine—and still, if you divide it, in every individual drop or particle. It is horrible to think of the consequences which must be expected to ensue if any person be so unfortunate as to chew the consecrated wafer instead of swallowing it entire and at once, as he is directed, and if particles happen to stick in his teeth. But Popish doctors, as we shall by and bye see, are most religiously careful that particles shall not stick in the teeth. And the rules on this point are an impressive commentary on the doctrine to which they owe their existence.

This opinion, that a whole Christ is contained in every individual drop or particle can derive no real support from a reference, such as Dr Milner makes, to the omnipresence of God, for God is a spirit. But Dr Milner must be allowed to speak in his own words. "Lastly, I answer, that God fills all space, and is whole and entire in every particle of matter; likewise, that my own soul is in my right hand and in my left, whole and entire."<sup>3</sup> But here, perhaps, we may pause, until some Popish doctor of our own day shall lay before us some proof in support of this assertion regarding the human soul. Perhaps Mr Keenan may yet favour the world with something on this subject, as, when treating on the subject of our Lord's person and natures, he says, by way of illustration, "Man's head is intimately con-

<sup>1</sup> Luke xxiv., 39.

<sup>2</sup> Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract., 114.

<sup>3</sup> Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxviii.

nected with his soul; yet it is not in every place where the soul is, otherwise the head would be in the feet also."<sup>1</sup>

Were we to admit as just, the Popish reasoning concerning the incompetency of our senses, or the fallibility of their testimony in the case now under consideration, it must follow that miracles no longer afford a proof of the truth of Christianity. These miracles were known to men through the evidence of their senses. Here, therefore, as already noticed, we perceive one of the many ways in which Popery tends to, and naturally engenders infidelity.

Archbishop Tillotson exposes the absurdity of the Popish doctrine by another argument, somewhat analogous to this. Supposing that doctrine to have been delivered in Scripture, in the very words used by the Council of Trent, it would be impossible, he says, to prove by any clearer evidence, that these words were there, than that by which it may be proved that the bread and wine remain bread and wine after consecration,—nay, in the latter case, we have the evidence of several of our senses, and only of one in the former.<sup>2</sup> It may be worthy of consideration also, that the evidence which the disciples originally had of the utterance by Christ of the words, "This is my body,"—of his actual presence with them,—of the existence of the bread upon the table,—and of his taking it in his hand, was no other than the evidence of their senses,—that same kind of evidence which Popish theologians pronounce so insufficient.

Papists are fond of appealing to the miracle of turning water into wine at Cana, and this they do in support of their argument from God's omnipotency, and because they seem to imagine that there is some similarity in this miracle to that which they pretend. Thus Dr Challoner inquiring, "How can bread and wine be changed into the body and blood of Christ?" replies, "By the Almighty power of God, (to whom nothing is hard or impossible), who formerly changed water into blood, and a rod

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xiii, sect. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Discourse on Transubstantiation.



into a serpent, Exod. vii.; and water into wine, St John ii., and who daily changes bread and wine by digestion into our body and blood."<sup>1</sup>

There is something very ludicrous in this reference to the process of digestion, but it is not in reality more preposterous than the reference to the miracle wrought on the waters of Egypt, or that wrought on the water at Cana. As for the omnipotency of God, we have seen that the controversy betwixt Papists and Protestants really involves no question about it. But there is a vast difference betwixt those miraculous transubstantiations here referred to, or those continually taking place by common natural processes, and this pretended one of the Popish Eucharist. The appearance, and the *accidents* or qualities of bread and wine are not preserved when they are changed into our body and blood by digestion; nor did the waters of Egypt preserve the appearance and qualities of water. The Egyptians would scarcely have been plagued by being merely *told* that the waters had been turned into blood; and it may be supposed that Moses would have found them sufficiently incredulous. In like manner at Cana, men's senses assured them that it was really wine which our Lord had furnished them with, and better wine than they had been drinking before. It seems a strange infatuation in Papists to refer to this miracle, the slightest consideration of which supplies so conclusive an argument against them. To have been at all parallel to their transubstantiation, the miracle at Cana must have been externally very different. The water should have retained the appearance and qualities of water, and the master of the feast and the guests should only have been required to *believe* that it was wine. Would they have believed it? Or would it have afforded any evidence of our Lord's omnipotency?

Papists are also fond of referring to the miraculous feeding of the multitudes, and particularly to the narrative of one of the

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, Cath. Christ. Instr., ch. v. sec. 4.

miracles of this kind in the sixth chapter of the Gospel according to John. This indeed, many of them seem to regard as their great stronghold in argument. But there was no illusion in this case. There was no believing that the reality was contrary to the appearance, the substance to the accidents. The food was good food. The multitudes ate and were filled. They got enough. The increase of the quantity further appears from the twelve baskets of fragments. The people were not each presented with a little morsel, and commanded to believe that it was as much as was wont to serve them for an ordinary meal. How then can this miracle be supposed to have any similarity to the alleged Popish miracle of transubstantiation?

However, Papists continually refer to this great miracle, or, as they seem fond of calling it, "this tremendous miracle," and they delight in expatiating upon its greatness, which they would fain represent as exceeding even that of the other miracles of our Lord. Mr Keenan, in his reply to one question, twice calls it an "astonishing miracle," and once a "tremendous miracle,"—much in the style of a showman desirous of making an impression on the rabble at a fair. All this is because the sixth chapter of John's Gospel contains some sayings of our Lord which Papists eagerly lay hold of as favourable to transubstantiation. They represent the miracle of feeding the five thousand as wrought for the special purpose of preparing the minds of the disciples for the statements which were about to be made upon that point. "And such a miracle was truly a suitable prelude," says Mr Keenan, "to the introduction of that miracle of miracles, the holy Eucharist."<sup>1</sup> "The very fact that he wrought this astonishing miracle before introducing the subject of the Eucharist, shows that he was about to speak on a matter that required strong faith in his followers and audience. If he had merely to announce to them that he was going to give them common bread and wine, is it likely he would have introduced it by such a tremendous miracle?"<sup>2</sup> Yet the assumption is too

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 2.—See p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.



glaring, that our Lord wrought the miracle in question for the purpose of introducing any such subject as that which Papists allege.

It is certain enough that our Lord upon that occasion employed the figure of eating and drinking in order to illustrate a greater thing: and although the new topic was introduced in an incidental manner,—in connection with the miracle, but not immediately after it,—it may most freely be admitted, that when he wrought the miracle, he contemplated the conversation to which it was to lead, and the use which he was to make of it for spiritual instruction. Perceiving the grossness and carnality of desire prevalent amongst those who followed him, “not because they saw the miracles, but because they did eat of the loaves and were filled,” he exhorted them to “labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life.”<sup>1</sup> It was a spiritual improvement, according to his manner, naturally arising out of the circumstances, and admirably suited to them. And some of his hearers having mentioned the manna which their fathers ate in the wilderness, our Lord proclaimed himself to be the true bread from heaven. Here it is to be observed, in the first place, that the miracle recently wrought was not even the subject of conversation in immediate connection with which our Lord spoke of himself as the true bread from heaven, and went on to speak of the necessity of eating his flesh and drinking his blood. The immediate subject of conversation was the manna which the ancient Israelites ate in the wilderness: a circumstance unfavourable to the Popish way of viewing this chapter. It is to be observed, in the second place, that these words of our Saviour, “I am the bread of life,”<sup>2</sup> are figurative at least to the same degree, as, according to the Protestant interpretation, are the words, “This is my body.” It is a sort of reversal of the same figurative form of speech. Nor does it seem possible, except for wilfulness and perverseness, to avoid the interpretation of these words as figurative, and to

<sup>1</sup> John vi. 27.

<sup>2</sup> John vi. 35 and 48.

understand the eating of this bread in a spiritual sense, of the exercise of faith, when Christ is found to say, “I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst;”<sup>1</sup> and again, “This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.”<sup>2</sup> But Papists actually assume the bread of life in this place<sup>3</sup> to mean the sacramental bread, though according to their own creed it is not bread which comes down from heaven, but the body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ, which come down and take the place and the appearance of the bread, as to which, whether it is annihilated or what becomes of it they are of different opinions, and we are left to conjecture. Our Lord speaks according to the appearance, they say. But this is far from being satisfactory on the part of those who contend so earnestly for the literal sense of words.

How beautiful and simple is this whole passage, if we understand our Lord as speaking throughout of the exercise of faith in himself, and employing the figure of eating and drinking to represent this exercise of faith and its appropriation of himself with all its benefits! This is the antitype of the manna. This is the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, for which he would have the people to labour, rather than for the meat which perisheth, such as they desired again, and as they had already received from his hand.

And having thus the key to the meaning of the passage, we find no difficulty as we proceed, although our Lord, still retaining the same figure, gives it another and more striking form, to point out the necessity of our feeding upon him by faith, *as slain and sacrificed for us*,—the antitype of other types as well as of the manna. “I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the

<sup>1</sup> John vi. 35.

<sup>2</sup> John vi. 50.

<sup>3</sup> And so to the end of the chapter. But they treat the preceding part of the chapter in which the bread of life is also spoken of, as merely relating to the exercise of faith. This must presently be considered.



life of the world. . . . Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me."<sup>1</sup> All this is still to be explained as referring to the exercise of faith.

It is wonderful in what inconsistencies and contradictions Papists involve themselves by their attempt to interpret these words literally of the eating of Christ's real flesh and blood in the Sacrament. The following quotation from Dr Challoner will illustrate this, where perhaps the reader will think that the attempt to get quit of a difficulty only makes the matter worse. "But does not Christ promise *eternal life*, St John vi. 51, 54, and 58, to every one that eateth of that bread of which he is there speaking; which promise cannot be understood with relation to the Sacrament, which many receive to their own damnation, 1 Cor. xi. 29?—He promises eternal life to every one that eateth of that bread: but this is to be understood, provided that he eat it worthily, and that he persevere in the grace which he thereby receives."<sup>2</sup> A pretty considerable departure from the literal sense! But Cardinal Wiseman has a simple argument to justify it. "There is always a condition annexed to God's promises." A startling announcement, the falsehood of which it would be easy enough to prove. However, it may be better to attend to the illustration which the Cardinal himself gives. "There is always a condition annexed to God's promises: 'He that believeth in me hath everlasting life,'—'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you.' Does the first mean that nothing more than faith is required for salvation. Is not each one bound to keep the

<sup>1</sup> John vi. 51–57.

<sup>2</sup> Challoner, Cath. Chr. Instr., ch. v., sect. 2.

commandments of God? The meaning clearly is,—he who believeth with such conditions, with such a fructifying faith as shall produce good works, shall have everlasting life."<sup>1</sup> If it had been given only as an explanation of the term faith, this might have been accepted. But if this is really the meaning, it establishes *no* condition limiting the promise. The Cardinal's argument is evidently founded on the Popish doctrine of meritorious works as a condition of salvation.

Our Lord, in this discourse to the Jews, employed eating and drinking as figures or illustrations of the exercise of faith. It was possible enough for the Jews so to understand him; although we read, that with a grossness and carnality in which they have been strangely followed by the theologians of Rome, they affixed a different meaning to his words. Faith had been thus symbolised under their law, and even before the giving of their law, in the eating of sacrifices. The like symbol was introduced afterwards under the New Testament dispensation in the Sacrament of the Supper. And this is the whole amount of connection betwixt the Sacrament of the Supper and the sixth chapter of John's Gospel. They relate to the same thing, and the same illustration is employed in the words of the one and the visible symbol and action of the other.

It ought to be considered that the Sacrament was not instituted when our Lord spoke the words recorded in the sixth chapter of John: and therefore, on the Popish supposition, they must have been perfectly unintelligible to his hearers. Now, we know that his words were not always understood, as in this very instance there were many who did not understand them; but he never employed words which were necessarily unintelligible. Such is, however, the unavoidable inference from the interpretation put upon this discourse by Papists—an interpretation appropriately proceeding from those who conduct their worship in a language unknown to the greater part of the congregation.

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 170.



Cardinal Wiseman dismisses this objection in a manner which deserves notice. He succeeds in discovering, if we may trust his quotation, that Dr Sherlock has said it would have been as difficult for the Jews to understand Christ, if speaking of mere believing under the figure of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, as to understand him if speaking of a Sacrament not yet instituted. But what follows is still more interesting :—

“To this we may add, that when our Lord inculcated on Nicodemus the necessity of baptism, that Sacrament was not yet instituted; and, therefore, in like manner, it is no sound argument to say, that because the Eucharist was not yet instituted, he could not speak of it as well.”<sup>1</sup>

But what if we doubt or deny the reference to baptism in our Lord’s discourse with Nicodemus?—which, indeed, has nothing whatever to do with baptism, except that, as in the case before us, the words used relate to the same thing with the visible symbol of the Sacrament, the figure being also similar.

In another work, (*Lectures on the Eucharist*), Dr Wiseman makes use of the same argument; and there he expresses himself as follows :—“Now, no one has ever yet thought of denying that the regeneration there mentioned referred to baptism, on the ground that this Sacrament had not yet been instituted. The discourse in the sixth chapter of St John, therefore, stands in the same relation to the institution of the Eucharist as the conference with Nicodemus does to the institution of baptism.” The statement of the last sentence may be admitted without qualification. The relation is the same precisely. But the sentence preceding betrays most astonishing ignorance or most culpable recklessness.

It may seem almost incredible, but it is nevertheless true, that arguing for the interpretation he does of the sixth chapter of John, Cardinal Wiseman makes it an objection against the Protestant interpretation, that it makes the discourse of our Lord incomprehensible to those who heard it, “since our Lord would be giving a precept with a promise of eternal life to its observers,

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, II., 170.

or a threat of eternal death to its violators, which would be totally unintelligible to his hearers.”<sup>1</sup> It matters not at present by what arguments the Cardinal sustains his opinion of the Protestant interpretation. We have only to do with the effrontery displayed in alleging this objection at all.

It is, however, a favourite notion of Papists, that Christ here promised the Sacrament of the Supper. Dr Milner, Dr Challoner, Dr Wiseman, and Mr Keenan all give it prominence. It is a dexterous mode of reasoning which they employ. First, let a man be persuaded that the passage relates to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper :—then, here we have proof of transubstantiation. In the next place, let a man view the Sacrament of the Supper in the light of this doctrine of transubstantiation, and what can be plainer than the reference to it in this chapter? It is, in fact, a beautiful instance of reasoning in a circle. The one thing proves the other, and again the second thing proves the first.

Before passing from this chapter, it seems proper to advert to the Popish mode of dealing with the 52d verse, where it is recorded that the Jews said, “How can this man give us his flesh to eat?” The opinion of the Jews is at once approved and disapproved! Bishop Challoner plainly tells us that the Jews, and those disciples who cried out, v. 61, “*This saying is hard, and who can hear it?*” understood our Saviour rightly, so far as relates to the real receiving of his flesh and blood; but as to the manner of receiving, they understood him not, since they had no thoughts of his giving himself whole and entire, veiled in a Sacrament, but apprehended the eating of his flesh cut off from his bones, and drinking of his blood, according to the vulgar manner of other meat and drink, which we digest and consume.”<sup>2</sup>—But how can a Papist object to the most vulgar notion of digesting and consuming?

It must be admitted that considerable ingenuity is displayed by Popish controversialists in order to make it appear that our Lord did not censure the opinion evidently entertained by the

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on the Eucharist*, 128.

<sup>2</sup> Challoner, *Cath. Christ. Instr.*, ch. v., sect. 2.



Jews as to the meaning of his words, in so far as they understood them literally and not figuratively, and to draw from the murmuring and falling away of many of his disciples an inference favourable to their opinion, as if it were this proposed eating of flesh and drinking of blood which staggered them, and not his claim to be revered as having come down from heaven. But their utmost ingenuity is displayed in getting over the difficulty presented by the 63d verse, which seems so plainly intended to correct the very error common to themselves and the unbelieving Jews. "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." In this verse, according to Mr Keenan, our Lord "clearly tells them that the eating of dead flesh will profit them nothing, but the flesh which he will give them is his glorified body, animated by his soul and his life-giving divinity,—that same body, soul, and divinity, by which, in the mystery of redemption, he was to give life to the world."<sup>1</sup> But how he clearly tells them all this, where nothing is said of a glorified body, and nothing of dead flesh,—and how in this exposition no notice is taken of his reference to the value of his words or doctrines, are points which remain to be explained.

Cardinal Wiseman has bestowed so much labour upon the argument from the sixth chapter of John, that his mode of framing and maintaining it deserves particular attention. Yet he himself is constrained to own that the interpretation of this passage had not been so uniform in the Church as to enable the Council of Trent to embody it in its decrees, and to impose it upon the Church's faith, as it did with its interpretation of the words of institution; and he even tells us that "Estius expressly writes, and other divines acknowledge, that there is not the same strength in the proof drawn from the discourse in St John, as in the words of institution."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxiv., sect. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on the Eucharist*, 170-173. The reader will regard with interest the following quotation:—"I have not the slightest shadow

He prepares the way in his Lectures at Moorfields, by laying down the principles by which he thinks it right to be guided in the examination of Scripture texts, and expresses no little dissatisfaction with the "vague and insufficient way" which people have of satisfying themselves,—"that is to say, when reading them over, and having in our minds a certain belief, we are sure to attach to them that meaning which seems either absolutely to support it, or is at least reconcilable with it."<sup>1</sup> It is no doubt very true that the evil exists which is here pointed out; but error may be committed on one side as well as on the other, and the effect of a preconceived opinion is perhaps as likely to be manifested when passages of Scripture are laboriously anatomized and disembowelled, as even when they are too hastily and superficially considered. Moreover, it is patent enough to observation that the greatest show of candour is sometimes made by those who have the deepest intention to deceive; and it need not surprise us if "an exposition of a few simple principles, which have their foundation in the philosophy of ordinary language and in common sense" should be the preface to a critical effort which sets at nought all principles really sound and just.

And what is the first principle laid down by the learned Cardinal? That he who speaks to others, wishes and means them

of doubt upon my own mind that the latter portion of the sixth chapter of St John refers to the Eucharist, and demonstrates the real presence; but for the proof drawn from the words of institution we have a higher authority than any hermeneutical reasoning can supply—the positive decree of the Council of Trent, which expressly defined that they prove the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the adorable Sacrament. But regarding the promise in St John, the holy Synod observed its usual caution, which proves how far it was from merely seeking to impose doctrines without sufficient proof to satisfy the conditions of our principle of faith. For the functions of a general Council being to define what the Church has always taught; as such unanimity among the ancient fathers, and among later divines, was not discovered, as could meet the intensity of proof required, it manifestly drew a distinction," &c. I forbear from offering any of the remarks which this passage suggests, although it is a text which invites a commentary.

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, &c., II., 136.



to understand him; which is cleverly transmuted by and bye, as if it were that the hearers *do* understand. "In fact," he says, "the object of all human intercourse, pursuant to the established laws of social communication, is to transfuse into other minds the same feelings and ideas that exist in one; and language is nothing more than the process whereby we endeavour to establish this communication." And this, after many words already expended upon it, he amplifies and illustrates as follows:—

"It is evident that we have here two terms, which are to be equalised—the mind of the speaker and that of the hearer; and if the process of communication be properly performed, the one must thoroughly represent the other. To illustrate this by comparison—if from the lines which you see impressed on paper from a copper-plate, you can reason, and that infallibly, to those inscribed on the plate, so can you, in like manner, if you see only the plate, just as correctly reason to the impression which must be thereby produced provided the process followed be correct, and calculated by its nature to communicate that impression. Just so, therefore, the object of any person who addresses others, either in writing or in speech, is to convey as clearly as possible, his meaning to their minds. If the processes of language be correct—except in extraordinary cases of error—for it is an exception if we misunderstand one another—if the act of imprinting be correctly performed, we receive the impressions and ideas which the writer or speaker intended to convey. And hence we can accurately reason from the meaning attached to a speech by those who heard it, to the ideas passing in the speaker's mind."<sup>1</sup>

The drift and object of all this is to prepare us for receiving, as of the utmost consequence in the interpretation of our Lord's words, the argument from the meaning attached to them by the

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on the Principal Doctrines, II., 137, 138. (See also Lectures on the Eucharist, 21, 22.) He actually prolongs this sort of remark on first principles through several further paragraphs. I give an additional sentence, with the valuable comments of Mr Sheridan Knowles. "*The true rule of interpretation is to know what must have been the only meaning which THE ACTUAL HEARERS, WHO WERE ALIVE AND PRESENT AT THE TIME THE WORDS WERE ADRESSED TO THEM, could have put on any expression*"—"You had saved three words at least by writing *THE ACTUAL HEARERS WHO WERE THE ACTUAL HEARERS*," says Mr Knowles—"and if we find that," the Cardinal proceeds, "to be a certain definite signification, and the only one which could have been given, it is clear that it must be

Jews at the moment they heard them; and notwithstanding a vain parade of other principles about the interpretation of language according to the *usus loquendi*, and the modifications arising from local and individual circumstances, with illustrations of the changes which take place in the meaning of words, it comes to this again—

"I shall investigate the expressions used by our Saviour on different occasions. I shall endeavour to put you in possession of the opinions of those who heard them, and to make you understand, from the language in which they were spoken, what was the only signification which they could possibly have attached to them."<sup>1</sup>

The principal place in the argument is given to the opinions of the Jews, although the Cardinal is too cautious to trust himself to this argument alone, but undertakes also to make it appear that the signification which they attached to the words was the only signification properly belonging to them. And although he admits that "when our Saviour spoke of coming down from heaven," the Jews "misunderstood him, so far, at least, as to call in question his having come down from heaven,"<sup>2</sup> (an admission, which, it may be remarked, that he need not have made, as it rather appears that the Jews *disbelieved* than that they *misunderstood* the statement,) yet he labours to convince us that their opinion on the point under consideration is of very great value:—

"So far, therefore, we have every reason to say, that they, who, in ordinary circumstances, must be considered the best interpreters of any expression used, agreed that our Saviour's words could convey no meaning to them but the literal one. I say in ordinary circumstances, because on any occasion, were you to read an account of what had taken place many

the true one." "Nothing can be clearer," says Mr Knowles. "If there be but one road from one place to another, the road must be the true one. It is clear—except to a Jesuit—that white is white, and that black is black; and it is equally clear that the *only* meaning which can be put upon any expression is the *only* signification which can be given to that expression." (See Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 138, and Knowles, The Idol Demolished by its own Priest, 52, 53.)

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 139.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, II., 156.



years ago, and there were expressions so obscure that you did not understand them, and could any one who had been on the spot explain them, and tell you what they meant, you would admit his testimony, and allow that, being a man of those times, he had a right to be considered a competent authority."<sup>1</sup>

We might, even in ordinary circumstances, require some further evidence of the competency of the man who had been on the spot, before we admitted his authority. But here it may be proper, as bearing on the circumstances of this particular case, and rendering unnecessary any further argument, to quote a few verses from the Gospel according to Matthew.

"And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing, see not; and hearing, they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."<sup>2</sup>

Such was the spiritual and mental condition of the persons with whose opinion Cardinal Wiseman is so much delighted,—representing it as of such importance in determining the sense of our Lord's discourse, that in one place, he even goes so far as to say, "his hearers, that is, those who were the true interpreters of his words."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 157. See also Lectures on the Eucharist, 101, 102.

<sup>2</sup> Matth. xiii., 10-15.

<sup>3</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 146.

But the Cardinal conducts his argument as if there were no reason to doubt that all who heard that discourse were of one mind as to its meaning.

"We come now," he says, in prosecution of his argument by a sort of examination of the chapter, "to another interesting incident. The disciples exclaim, 'This is a hard saying,'—the meaning of which expression is, This is a disagreeable, an odious proposition. For it is in this sense that the phrase is used by ancient authors. 'This is a hard saying, and who can hear it.' 'It is impossible', in other words, 'any longer to associate with a man who teaches us such revolting doctrines as these.' I ask, would they have spoken thus, had they understood him to be speaking only of believing in him? But what is our Saviour's conduct to these disciples? What is his answer? Why, he allows all to go away, who did not give in their adhesion, and at once believe him on his word; he says not a syllable to prevent their abandoning him, and 'they walked no more with him.' . . . In the second place, what is the conduct of the Apostles? They remain faithful,—they resist the suggestions of natural feeling—they abandon themselves to his authority without reserve. 'To whom shall we go?' they exclaim, 'Thou hast the words of eternal life.' It is manifest that they do not understand him, any more than the rest,"—

(Yet it seems as if the whole argument were framed upon the supposition that both they and *the rest* understood him,)

"but they submit their judgments to him, and he accepts the sacrifice, and acknowledges them for his disciples on this very ground. 'Have I not chosen you twelve?' 'Are you not my chosen friends, who will not abandon me, but remain faithful in spite of the difficulties opposed to your conviction?'"<sup>1</sup>

Passing over such things in this quotation, however interesting, as do not bear upon the point immediately before us, let us first notice the shameful misrepresentation of the simple Scripture narrative. "THE DISCIPLES exclaim, 'This is a hard saying.'" Such is the interesting incident which Cardinal Wiseman invites us to consider. But compare these words with the words of the Evangelist. "MANY therefore OF HIS DISCIPLES, when they had heard this, said, 'This is an hard saying,' &c."<sup>2</sup> Remark is unnecessary; it is enough to point out the difference.

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 165, 166.

<sup>2</sup> John vi., 60.



It may be added that the Evangelist repeats his qualifying expression, when he says, "From that time MANY OF HIS DISCIPLES went back, and walked no more with him."<sup>1</sup> And a proper attention to what is contained in the intervening verses, makes the misrepresentation appear, if possible, in a still worse light. But proceeding to what relates to the Apostles, how are we to account for Dr Wiseman's making so monstrous a blunder, if blunder it be, as to quote the words, "Have not I chosen you twelve?" and give this gloss of them, "Are you not my chosen friends, who will not abandon me, but remain faithful in spite of the difficulties opposed to your conviction?" Did he not know that this was totally at variance with the scope of the passage? Did he not see in his Bible, the whole sentence of which he quoted only such a part as by itself might seem to sustain his gloss? "Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Again it is enough merely to quote without remark; it is enough to compare these words with the words which Cardinal Wiseman gives as the full expression of our Saviour's meaning.<sup>2</sup>

But, in fact, even if the Jews were to be admitted as true and authoritative interpreters, this discourse of our Lord would not sustain the Popish doctrine. This argument is admirably conducted against Dr Wiseman, by Dr Turton, in a work already quoted, his "Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist considered." From the pages which he has devoted to this subject, I may be allowed to quote a few sentences:—"What, then," he asks, "did the Jews really understand by eating the flesh of Christ? Beyond all doubt, they understood it to signify the actual eating of the natural flesh of the individual whom

<sup>1</sup> John vi., 66.

<sup>2</sup> "It is impossible, Sir, to imagine that you believe in what you thus deliberately set down, without attributing to the influence of strong delusion this grossest divergence from the truth. Your suppression of an *inseparable* portion of the text, would seem to justify a still more degrading inference." (Mr Sheridan Knowles; *The Idol Demolished by its own Priest*, an answer to Cardinal Wiseman's Lectures on Transubstantiation; p. 131.)

they beheld." And having shewn that this was regarded as their opinion, and reprobated as their opinion by writers of the highest estimation in the Church of Rome,<sup>1</sup> he proceeds to point out the true character of Cardinal Wiseman's argument. "When Dr Wiseman has fairly persuaded his readers that he is discussing the Jewish interpretation, he contrives, no one sees how or when, but with a dexterity which cannot be too much admired, and a disingenuousness which cannot be too severely reprobated, to substitute, as if it were the same thing, the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Now this sacramental interpretation is *not* the same with the Jewish interpretation."—If the Popish interpretation were correct, then certainly the Jews were far enough away from it, who thought of eating "dead flesh," as Popish commentators tell us,<sup>2</sup> or of eating flesh and drinking

<sup>1</sup> Here Dr Turton quotes the note on John vi. 63, from the Rhemish Testament. "This carnality of theirs, [the Jews] stood in two points specially: First, that they imagined that he would kill himself, and cut and mangle his flesh into parts, and so give it them raw or roast to be eaten among them. Which could not be meant, saith St Augustine, for that had contained an heinous and barbarous fact; and, therefore, they might, and should have been assured, that he would command no such thing; but some other sweet sense to be of his hard, mystical, and figurative words; and to be fulfilled in a Sacrament, mystery, and a marvellous divine sort, otherwise than they could comprehend. Secondly, they did err touching his flesh, in that they took it to be the flesh of a mere man, and of a dead man also, when it should come to be eaten." But the annotations of the Rhemish Testament have undergone successive modifications, to accommodate them to the state of mind in Britain, and, accordingly, on looking into a copy of the Rhemish Testament in a Popish pocket Bible, (Lond., Simms & M'Intyre, 1850,) I find not the above note on John vi. 63, but the following, less gross and barbarous in expression, but still amply sufficient for the purpose of the present argument. "Christ, by mentioning his ascension, by this instance of his power and divinity, would confirm the truth of what he had before asserted; and, at the same time, correct their gross apprehension of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, in a vulgar and carnal manner, by letting them know he should take his whole body living with him to heaven; and, consequently, not suffer it to be, as they supposed, divided, mangled, and consumed upon earth."

<sup>2</sup> See Rhemish Test., note on v. 64; and Mr Keenan, above quoted.



blood with all the natural qualities of human flesh and blood, not under the accidents of bread and wine.

But it is time that we proceed to notice some other parts of Cardinal Wiseman's argument from this chapter.

He is at great pains to establish a division of our Lord's discourse into sections,—a division, the most unnatural and unreasonable that can be imagined. It is, however, necessary to the Popish interpretation of the chapter, and may be found in the works of Dens, Perrone, and other such authors. "All are agreed," he tells us, "that the first part of the chapter, from the beginning to the 26th verse, is simply historical, and gives us an account of the miracle wrought by our Saviour, in feeding a multitude of persons with a small quantity of bread. All are also agreed as to the next portion of the chapter; that is, from the 26th, so far as about the 50th verse, that in it our Saviour's discourse is about faith." But "at that verse, or somewhere about it, a change takes place in our Saviour's discourse," and he is to be understood as speaking not of faith, "but solely of the real eating of his body, and drinking of his blood sacramentally in the Eucharist." The Protestant view of the chapter is thus stated:—"Protestants, on the other hand, maintain that the same discourse is continued, and the same topic kept up to the conclusion of the chapter."<sup>1</sup> It might have been as well,—at least as fair,—to have stated at the commencement, that according to the Protestant view, whilst the same topic is kept up, new ideas as well as new terms are introduced, and that by the aid of these new terms, the subject is more fully exhibited, and a greater amount of doctrine declared. It is rather a meagre account, moreover, of what Dr Wiseman calls the second part of the chapter, to say, that it is *about faith*. It is surely, at least, as much about the object of faith. But this,—which, so far as I know, not even a Popish author has ever *denied*,—it would not have suited a Popish purpose so well to have plainly stated. It is kept out of sight.

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 140.

Dr Wiseman differs from what he says is the common opinion in his Church as to the exact place at which the transition takes place in our Saviour's discourse. It is commonly put at the 51st verse; he puts it at the 48th, for reasons which he exhibits. But it seems not to have occurred to him that here he exhibited the weakness of his whole argument, and that this difference of opinion as to the verse at which the transition takes place, ought of itself to create a doubt whether it takes place at all.

To prove, however, the reality of the transition, he begins by shewing why he believes the first portion of our Saviour's discourse to apply to faith, which is "for this simple reason, that every expression he uses throughout it is such as was familiar to the Jews, as referring to the subject. For the ideas of giving bread, and of partaking of food, were commonly applied to teaching and receiving instruction, consequently there was no misunderstanding them."<sup>1</sup> But would he have us to believe that this was really all, or that nothing more was meant in all the passages which he quotes from the Old Testament in proof of this meaning of these terms, especially the very first of them, "All you that thirst come unto the waters, and you that have no money, make haste, buy and eat. Hearken diligently to me, and eat that which is good"?<sup>2</sup> where, to say nothing of the omission of part of the text without any indication of such omission, if we are to believe that "to eat is here applied to listening unto instruction," as Dr Wiseman says it is, we must also believe that the prophet, or rather the prophet's Lord, invites men to *hearken* unto him just that they may *hearken* unto him.<sup>3</sup> But surely something more was meant by this eating, in order to which men are so earnestly invited to hearken and to incline their ear. But, this point settled to his satisfaction, Cardinal Wiseman goes on:—

"Therefore, when our Saviour simply addresses the Jews, speaking to

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 143.

<sup>2</sup> Is. lv., 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Knowles, The Idol Demolished, 28.



them of the food whereof they are to partake, I have no difficulty in supposing that he could be understood by all, as referring to faith in him and his teaching. But in order to contrast these expressions more strongly with those that follow, allow me to notice a peculiarity observable at the 35th verse. Throughout the first part of this chapter, if you read it carefully over, you will not find our Saviour allude to the idea of eating; he does not once speak of 'eating the bread which came down from heaven.' On the contrary, in the 35th verse, he actually violates the ordinary rhetorical proprieties of language, to avoid this harsh and unnatural figure."<sup>1</sup>

Higher proprieties than the rhetorical proprieties of language are violated here, in the application of such an expression to the Saviour. But is it true that he does not allude to the idea of eating, in the part of the chapter concerning which the assertion is made? Is not this idea implied in the mention of *bread*? What else is bread for but to be eaten? And were the assertion correct, what would become of the *parallel to the former food from heaven*, the manna, of which Dr Wiseman has already spoken?<sup>2</sup> By some inadvertency he becomes inconsistent with himself. And notwithstanding his assertion, it is evident enough that there is allusion to eating, and moreover that the Jews thought of an actual eating as when their fathers ate manna in the desert, when apparently comparing his recent miracle, in which they had been supplied with food to eat, with the miracle by which their fathers were supplied with manna, and foolishly demanding some greater sign, they said, "What sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? What dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he that cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread."<sup>3</sup> And another way may be found of explaining the 35th verse than that which in-

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 144.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., II., 141.

<sup>3</sup> John vi., 30-34.

volves a departure from rhetorical proprieties. "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." If, indeed, the eating and coming be equally and in the very same way significant of believing, there is a difficulty in the verse, but the assumption is both gratuitous and absurd. The coming to Christ naturally describes the first act of faith, and the feeding upon him, those acts which are subsequent thereto, the use and appropriation which faith makes of Christ throughout all the days of the Christian life. And it is worse than ridiculous in Cardinal Wiseman to inform us, that "in the instances where the figure of food is applied to hearing or believing doctrine, the inspired writers never say, 'Come and eat or receive me.'"<sup>1</sup> No, certainly; because they speak not of themselves but of Christ.

It is a great matter, in Cardinal Wiseman's estimation, that our Saviour never recurs to the figure of bread or food, from the 35th verse to the 47th verse of the chapter, "but speaks simply of faith in him, or of its equivalent, coming to him."<sup>2</sup> But that it is no great matter at all, in relation to the present question, will be sufficiently evident to any one who considers the tenor of these verses, in which the ideas of coming unto Christ, and the Father's drawing men unto Christ, and Christ's having come down from heaven, are the most prominent, and the blessedness is declared of those who do come to Christ, and shall be raised up to everlasting life; whilst even within the compass of these verses, we are told that "the Jews murmured at him, because he said, I am the BREAD which came down from heaven."<sup>3</sup> However, it is surprising enough to find that Cardinal Wiseman ventures to speak of our Lord as having spent thirteen verses in doing away with the obscurity of his parabolic expressions, and in giving the explanation of its [his?] figures,"<sup>4</sup> verses 35-47 being the thirteen verses mentioned. Any one who

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., II., 145.

<sup>3</sup> John vi., 41.

<sup>4</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 62.



has a Bible may easily satisfy himself of the character of this statement.

"Now, then," says the Cardinal, "let us come to the second part of the discourse. The first portion he closes thus:— 'Amen, amen, I say unto you, he that believeth in me hath everlasting life.' We may consider this a proper epilogue or conclusion."<sup>1</sup> What! when the next words are, "I am that [or the] bread of life," and the discourse makes reference again to the former conversation, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die."<sup>2</sup> Can sane men believe that the bread of life means something quite different here from what it means in the former part of the chapter, being equally said to come down from heaven? or that what follows ("I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,") is aught else than a fuller exhibition of the doctrine already declared?

By a most extraordinary misapplication of learning, in his Lectures on the Eucharist, Cardinal Wiseman ingeniously labours to construct an argument in support of this fancied transition in our Lord's discourse, from the parallelisms of Hebrew poetry.

"The motive, however, which principally induces me to see a clear separation between v. 47 and 48, and which forbids me to allow any other transition or break in the discourse, till its complete interruption at v. 53, is the connection of the entire passage in what is known by the name of *poetical parallelism*."<sup>3</sup>

Here he refers with approbation to the works of Lowth, Herder, and Jebb, particularly to the extension by the latter of this characteristic of Hebrew poetry "to the structure of the New Testament,"—he ought to have said, "to the structure of many passages of the New Testament." It is not, indeed, in such passages as that at present in question that a sober critic would

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 145, 146.

<sup>2</sup> John vi., 48-50.

<sup>3</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 47.

seek for the poetical parallelism. And well may we wonder that on such a refinement should be made to depend a question of interpretation, involving, as Papists themselves tell us, eternal life or death. But what, then, is Cardinal Wiseman's exhibition of the parallelism or symmetrical structure to which he deems it of so much importance to attend?

"The following is the whole section of our Saviour's discourse, versicularly arranged—

(a) 'I am the bread of life.

(b) 'Your fathers did eat manna (*bread from heaven*, see v. 31, 32) in the desert

(c) 'And are dead.

(a) 'This is the bread

(b) 'Descending from heaven, (such)

(c) 'That if any one eat of it he may not die.

(a) 'I am the living bread

(b) 'Which came down from heaven.

(c) 'If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.

'And the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.'

"You cannot avoid remarking the nice balance of these lines; all those marked (a) contain the same ideas of *bread*, and generally of life, the second ones (b) speak of the descent of this bread from heaven, contrasted with the manna; the third (c) impress its worth in the same comparative view. The last clause sums up and embodies the substance of the preceding."

Now, without asserting that there is nothing here at all analogous to the poetical parallelism of the Hebrews, it is easy to shew that Dr Wiseman has not made a fair exhibition of the structure of the passage. The first sentence, "I am the bread of life," (v. 48), stands distinct and separate from all the rest, evidently referring to the previous part of the discourse, and the bread of life already mentioned. It is ridiculous to compare this with the sentences marked (a) in the succeeding triplets,—more particularly as the sentence (b) in the first triplet includes so much more than (b) in the others. "Your fathers did eat manna (*bread from heaven*) in the desert." It is evident that to make this first triplet correspond with the rest, it would be

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 48, 49.



requisite to divide its first and second members from each other, *in the middle of the word Manna.*

Your fathers did eat bread  
From heaven.

But it so happens that although *Bread from heaven* suits Cardinal Wiseman's notion of a poetical parallelism, our Lord did not say *Bread from heaven*, but *Manna*, and the word cannot be divided betwixt two lines. And this is not all the excess of the line or sentence (*b*) in the first triplet. The words *In the desert* are completely out of place in this *versicular arrangement*, and refuse to become part of the metre. But it is needless to carry further an analysis or examination of this strange piece of critical ingenuity. Enough has been said to shew how worthless it is for any purpose of argument, and even if it had been better in itself, it would have borne the weight of no such argument as its author tries to suspend upon it.

But the great argument in support of the alleged transition, is from the new expressions employed in the latter part of the discourse. On this Cardinal Wiseman insists much. Our Lord, he tells us, "begins to use another form of phraseology, which he had carefully avoided in the first part of his discourse." We have already seen how far it is from being true that our Lord, in the commencement of his discourse, carefully avoided reference to eating. But Cardinal Wiseman, in another place, affirms that he carefully avoids "throughout the first part, the harsh expression to *eat him*, even where the turn of the phrase seemed to invite him to use it; on the contrary, in the latter section, he employs it without scruple, and even repeats it again and again."<sup>1</sup> "Here," says Dr Turton, "is another instance of the recklessness of this learned writer. Our Lord has used the expression, to *eat him*, once, that is in the 57th verse; but so far was he from repeating it again and again, that he never used it *except that once*. In whatever view such misrepresentations are beheld, what confidence can possibly be placed in the individual who has thus presented them to the world?"

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 63.

It can be of no avail to Dr Wiseman, to allege that, by the expression to *eat him*, he meant to *eat his flesh*, or to eat the *bread of life*; for he has separately treated of these latter expressions. My fear is, that he intended to write what he did write, and that, by what he wrote, he also intended to produce a considerable effect."<sup>1</sup>

Again, we are told, that "in the former part of his discourse, our Saviour always speaks of this bread as given by his Father," whilst in the second portion of it, he says that he himself gives it. "The giver is different in the two cases, and we are consequently authorized to suppose that the gift likewise is different."<sup>2</sup> Too hasty an inference surely from such premises!—when the givers are God the Father, and Jesus Christ. But the statement that in the former part of his discourse, *our Saviour always speaks of this bread as given by his Father*, is met by a reference to one of its first sentences, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto everlasting life, WHICH THE SON OF MAN SHALL GIVE UNTO YOU; for him hath God the Father sealed."<sup>3</sup>

But there is still, it seems, another difference of phraseology betwixt the first and the second parts of this discourse. "Our Saviour, in the first part of the discourse, speaks of the consequence of this partaking of the bread of life, as consisting in our being brought or drawn unto him, or coming to him."<sup>4</sup> Let us pause for a moment to observe how contrary this statement is to the plain sense of Scripture. The being brought or drawn to Christ, or coming to Christ, is not spoken of as the *consequence* of partaking of the bread of life, but the opposite order is rather indicated, "He that cometh to me shall never hunger." So profound a biblical critic is this Cardinal!—But these expressions,—*being brought or drawn to Christ*, or *coming to Christ*,—are throughout the New Testament, he says, applied to faith.

<sup>1</sup> Turton, Roman Cath. Doct. of the Eucharist considered, 81.

<sup>2</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, &c., II., 147.—See also Lectures on the Eucharist, 63, 64.

<sup>3</sup> John vi., 27. See Turton, 84.

<sup>4</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 147.



And he finds nothing of faith except in the first part of the discourse. "In the second part, our Saviour never speaks of our being brought to him; but always of our abiding in him, or being incorporated with him, which expressions are used to denote love and charity." And an argument is founded upon this change of expression, and adoption of one which applies "to a totally different virtue." Does it then apply to a totally different virtue? I shall not expend time in shewing that *abiding in Christ* is an expression which has at least as much reference to faith as to love. It is a desperate effort to argue from the use of this expression in the case before us, that a new subject is introduced, "and some institution alluded to, which is to unite us to Christ, not merely through faith, but through love."<sup>1</sup>

However, it is in the examination of the phrases *eating the flesh* of the Son of Man and *drinking his blood*, that the Cardinal puts forth all his strength. Here it is that he makes a parade of learning as ridiculous as the distinctive garments of his rank,—covering his pages with Arabic characters, and quoting the Koran, and the Hamasa, and the poet Nawabig, and Meidan, and Schanfari, and Lokman the Wise, and the Latin poet Martial, and turning to the Syriac and the Chaldaic, and to Aben Ezra and Michaelis and Jahn and Ammon and Winer and Gesenius,—all to prove that the eating of a man's flesh was figuratively expressive of the attempt to do him some serious injury, principally by calumny or false accusation.<sup>2</sup> His argument is not that it is such an idiomatic expression as is limited to this idiomatic sense; but that having this familiar figurative sense, it must either be taken in this sense or literally. The assumption is perfectly gratuitous: and the labour expended on the figurative sense is wasted,—as well as all the observations about tropes in general, and types and figures, a preliminary disquisition by which the examination of these expressions is introduced. However frequently the expressions used by our Lord might be em-

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 148.

<sup>2</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 71-81.

ployed with reference to calumny or other injury, yet it was clear enough that it was not in this sense that he employed them, and, in particular, from the words, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."<sup>1</sup> And this sense being set aside, as indeed it seems never for a moment to have occurred to any mind, the words were free, so to speak, to bear any signification, literal or figurative, of which, in their own nature, they were properly capable.

But, says the Cardinal,

"It is supposed by Protestants that by eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, nothing more was meant than a figure or image of believing in him. If this be the case, I might observe, for instance, that if to eat the bread of life meant simply to believe in Christ, it follows, that the verb to *eat* is equivalent to the verb to *believe*. When, therefore, our Saviour speaks of eating his flesh, if eating be equivalent to believing, we must suppose that he meant believing in his flesh, a doctrine quite different and totally distinct from the other, and which no one has imagined our Saviour to have here taught."<sup>2</sup>

Is not this one of the vilest quibbles that ever was used in any debate? Because eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ are figuratively expressive of believing in him, it must follow that to eat and to believe are equivalent to one another, and so eating the flesh must be believing *in the flesh* of Christ! Upon a single word of a figurative expression is fastened the signification of the whole. But the argument does not deserve a more minute examination.

It may be noted as curious also how Dr Wiseman argues from the word *αληθως* in the 55th verse, "My flesh is meat *INDEED*, and my blood is drink *INDEED*." It confirms, he says, the literal meaning of Christ's words.<sup>3</sup> Yet, plainly enough, it does not affect the meaning of the words *flesh* and *blood*, but of the words *meat* and *drink*, and merely gives force to a statement of doctrine concerning the value of this food of the soul. Dr Wiseman is only trifling with us in saying that "when a person says that a thing is *verily* so, we must understand him, as far

<sup>1</sup> John vi. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 148.

<sup>3</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 131, 132.



as it is possible for language to express it, in a literal signification."<sup>1</sup>

The difficulty presented by the 63d verse, Cardinal Wiseman overcomes in the same way with many other Popish authors, by assigning to the words *flesh* and *spirit*, when opposed to each other, a certain determinate signification, "a definite meaning which never varies,"—*the flesh* signifying "the corrupted dispositions and weak thoughts of human nature," and *the spirit* "the sentiments of man as elevated and ennobled by grace;"—"the natural and the spiritual man, or human nature as left to its own impulses, and as ennobled and strengthened by grace." "Christ's words are spirit and life, or 'the spirit of life,' by a grammatical figure common in sacred and profane writers; in other words, such as the mere man cannot receive, but which require a strong power of grace to make them acceptable."<sup>2</sup> And for proofs of this *definite meaning*, we are referred to no fewer than fourteen texts of the New Testament. But, singularly enough, the very text under consideration *is never correctly quoted*. First, it is given without the first clause. "A second text popularly adduced against us is the 64th<sup>3</sup> verse:—'The flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken to you, they are spirit and life.'"<sup>4</sup> Dr Wiseman *seems* to quote a whole verse, but he omits an important part, "It is the spirit that quickeneth." Then, in the course of his argument, he transposes the parts of the verse, and deals with them as if they ran in another order. "'The wisdom of the flesh is death;' 'the flesh profiteth nothing;' 'the wisdom of the spirit is life;' 'it is the spirit that quickeneth.'"<sup>5</sup>—Mr Knowles very happily proposes to substitute for the words *flesh* and *spirit* in this verse, the equivalents which Dr Wiseman gives for them. "The natural man, or human nature left to its own impulses, profiteth nothing; the

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 165.

<sup>2</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 155. Lectures on Principal Doct., II., 171.

<sup>3</sup> So numbered in the Vulgate.

<sup>4</sup> Lectures on the Eucharist, 152.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 155.

words which I have spoken to you are the spiritual man, or human nature ennobled and strengthened by grace."<sup>1</sup>

Cardinal Wiseman lightly dismisses the Protestant argument from the 63d verse, on the strength of his fourteen texts, as a *popular argument*, and of no solid weight whatever. His own attempt to interpret the verse may confirm our belief that we have rightly understood it as condemnatory of that literal interpretation which the unbelieving Jews had put upon our Saviour's words, and in which they are now followed by the theologians of Rome.

I have only touched upon a few principal points in Cardinal Wiseman's argument from John vi., the refutation of which forms an important part of the valuable works of Dr Turton and Mr Knowles. But although a space proportionately so considerable has been devoted to it here, I have found it impossible to exhibit, without much greater enlargement, more than mere specimens of the manner in which the argument is conducted,—the labyrinthine entanglements, the disquisitions apparently intended for no other purpose than that of perplexing and bewildering the reader until he shall completely have lost sight of the question at issue and of the course by which he has been led,—the accumulations of learning, as little to the purpose as if pages had been borrowed at random from lexicographers and scholiasts,—the assertions which the slightest examination proves to be incorrect, and—to say nothing further of characteristics more important and worthy to be regarded with deeper feeling—the embarrassing verbosity of the style, and faults such as would have brought a school-boy to punishment.

It is usual with Protestants to argue from the words of the Apostle Paul, who again and again, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, calls the bread in the Sacrament *bread*, even when applied to its sacramental use, as shewing that the Apostle's ideas were entirely at variance with the doctrine of transubstantiation. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew

<sup>1</sup> The Idol Demolished by its own Priest, 121.



the Lord's death till he come; wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup,"<sup>1</sup> &c. On this Mr Keenan first remarks—"He calls it bread because it has the *appearance* of bread; but he calls it *this bread*, clearly showing that it had something extraordinary about it."<sup>2</sup> It might seem almost incredible that an argument so weak and ridiculous should be seriously propounded, had we not abundant instances of the same sort in Popish books. "He calls it *this bread*!" Of course, the Apostle did not mean to say the same of all eating of bread, but only of the bread set apart for that special purpose. The bread in the Lord's Supper is mere ordinary bread, but the feast is no mere ordinary feast. To partake of that bread is a different thing from partaking of any other bread.

As for the Apostle's speaking according to the appearance, this supposition is very contrary to the rule so much contended for, of strict literal interpretation. But Mr Keenan maintains it by referring to a number of instances in which "the thing changed bears the name of that from which it is transubstantiated."—"Again," he says, "we have many examples of Scripture in which the thing changed bears the name of that from which it is transubstantiated. Thus, Gen. ii., Eve is called the *bone* of Adam; in Gen. iii. Adam is called *dust*, because he is made of dust; Exodus vii., Aaron's rod is called a *rod*, after it became a serpent; John ii., the *water*, after being changed into wine, is called *water*. The Scripture, too, often calls things what they *appear* to be. Thus Gen. xvii., *angels* in human form are called *men*."<sup>3</sup> Now, not one of these instances is in the least to the point. In the first place, the meaning in all of them is obvious, whereas on the Popish supposition the very contrary is the case in the institution of the Sacrament. And in all of them, what Mr Keenan calls the transubstantiation is very dif-

ferent from that for which he argues; the substance and accidents being changed at once, and not the substance alone whilst the accidents remain, the pretence of which makes the Popish transubstantiation the sublimest instance of effrontery that ever was exhibited to the world. And no little effrontery appears even in the reference here made to John ii., where it will not be found that the wine is called *water* after the miracle; what is said, being, "When the ruler of the feast had tasted *the water that was made wine*, and knew not whence it was (but the servants that drew the water knew)," &c.<sup>1</sup> To allege that here the *water*, after being changed into wine, is called *water*, is despicable quibbling. Nor are the other instances less shameful:—And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh,"<sup>2</sup> or the words of the Lord to Adam after his fall, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."<sup>3</sup> Cardinal Wiseman produces what at first looks somewhat better as an instance, from John ix. 17—"They say again to the *blind* man,"—that is, to the man who had been blind, but who had been miraculously restored to sight. But a moment's consideration will shew how natural it was in the circumstances to use that abbreviated expression as sufficiently designating the man, in the course of a narrative having reference throughout to him and his blindness and its cure, but that the case is very different where the Apostle Paul, arguing about another subject altogether, has occasion to allude to the Sacrament of the Supper, and in his very first mention of it, uses the term *bread*. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Nay more, as the Apostle here speaks in the same sentence both of that bread and of the body of Christ, it may fairly be concluded that he did not hold them to be identical one with another,—unless the sentence were an *assertion* of their identity, which it is not, but part of an argument concerning idolatry. Cardinal Wiseman's instance would have been more pertinent if, on the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xi., 26-28.<sup>2</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 6.<sup>3</sup> Ibid.<sup>1</sup> John ii. 9.<sup>2</sup> Gen. ii. 23.<sup>3</sup> Gen. iii. 19.



first mention of a man who had been cured of blindness, he were called a blind man—But if the Cardinal had produced no other instance than this, his argument would have had a more respectable appearance, than when he also refers to the rod of Moses, and to the water made wine, saying of the latter, “It could not be both water and wine; it should have been called simply wine, but it is called ‘water made wine,’ so as to preserve the name which it had before!”<sup>1</sup>—where his puerility is absolutely wonderful.

“On this all-important matter,” says Mr Keenan, “the arguments from Scripture seem inexhaustible.”<sup>2</sup>—How should they not, their nature being taken into account? And amongst the arguments which he adduces, several are founded upon expressions used by the Apostle Paul. “St Paul,” he tells us, “records the institution in the very language adopted by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and adds, that he has learned what he writes from *the Lord*. Now, if Christ,” he goes on to argue, “had spoken in figures at the institution, would it not be natural to expect that, in this new revelation to St Paul, who was not present at the Last Supper, he should vary the language so as to afford some explanation of the figures? And yet he does not. The same words are adhered to with the most wonderful exactness.” Might it not have occurred to Mr Keenan that here also we have just another simple historic account of what took place, and that to suppose a variation in the words, such as he speaks of, would be to suppose an inaccuracy in the narrative—a departure from historic truth? In so far, therefore, as the controversy concerning the words of institution is concerned, this additional narrative leaves the matter just as it was before. But, not adverting to the consideration of historic accuracy or inaccuracy, truth or falsehood, Mr Keenan goes on in the following remarkable strain:—

“Again, St Paul knew the true meaning of these words; and if he un-

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 219.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 5.

derstood them to mean mere bread and wine used as a figure or commemoration, why did he not, in writing as he was, in Greek, to the Corinthians, say, This is *a figure of my body*, or a commemoration of my blood, or *This SIGNIFIES my body and my blood?*<sup>1</sup>

Another argument follows from the words, “The chalice of *benediction* which we bless, is it not the *communion of the blood of Christ?* And the bread which we break, is it not the *partaking of the body of the Lord?*”<sup>2</sup> And here he says, “Why does not St Paul now explain these figures to the simple and the unlettered? Why does he now, when he ought to be plain and clear, call the bread, the *body*, and wine, the *blood of Christ?*”<sup>3</sup> But the Apostle does *not* call the bread, the *body*, and the wine, the *blood of Christ*. He says, “The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” or, according to the Popish version, “Is it not the *partaking* of the body of Christ?”—the meaning of which, in reference to something far more spiritual than the profanely imagined swallowing of that glorified body, it is not very difficult to perceive.

On this text Cardinal Wiseman reasons somewhat differently from his less dignified brother.

“In these words the Apostle is contrasting the Jewish and heathenish sacrifices and rites with those of the Christians. No doubt but, when he speaks of their actions and sacrifices, it is of eating and drinking really that he treats, for indeed, he is speaking of realities throughout. When, therefore, he contrasts these with the realities of the Christian institutions, and when he asks if these be not infinitely better and perfecter than what the Jews enjoyed, because our cup is a partaking of the blood of Christ, and our bread was a partaking of the body of the Lord; do not these words imply that there was a contrast, a real contrast between the two?—that the one was partaken of as really as the other? that if their victims were truly eaten, we also have one that is no less received?”<sup>4</sup>

It is well asked by Mr Knowles, “Do you exemplify a real contrast by a real similarity?”<sup>5</sup> It is, indeed, an analogy and

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv. sect. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Cor. x. 16., (as Mr Keenan quotes).

<sup>3</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 214.

<sup>5</sup> The Idol Demolished, 200.



not a contrast which is pointed out by Paul, as to sacrifices and rites, and this alone was suited to the scope of his argument. And since Cardinal Wiseman says that Paul asks if the realities of the Christian institutions are not infinitely better and perfecter than what the Jews enjoyed,—let him shew where, in the whole passage now under consideration, the Apostle asks anything of the kind. But the Cardinal's whole argument illustrates the tendency so often and strangely manifested by Papists to assume and argue from the thing they are to prove. That the Apostle treats of realities, and especially of eating and drinking really, are foolish observations, when the question is not whether the eating and drinking be real, but what it really is which men eat and drink.

The following from Mr Keenan, may be quoted as curious, but does not seem to require much remark.

“What does St Paul say in the next verse? (1 Cor. x. 17.)

“After having said that we are partakers of the body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine,”—[his own gloss upon what the Apostle has said,]—“he now adds, ‘For we being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread.’ Now in the Catholic sense of the Sacrament, these words are true strictly, for we all partake of ONE AND THE SAME BREAD, that is, the sacred flesh of the Lord;—‘The bread which I will give, is my flesh;’—but in the Protestant sense St Paul's words would be nonsense, for if the Sacrament be mere bread, then each receiver partakes of a different bread; and hence, as the bread upon which they feed is not one, so neither can they be cemented into one body. Protestants, therefore, being neither *one bread*, nor *one body*, are not the sort of Christians to whom St Paul addressed himself.”<sup>1</sup>

It will be granted that there is a certain sort of ingenuity here, and that combined with the grossness of the notion about the literal eating of the sacred flesh, there is a considerable subtilty and refinement in regard to the question, in what unity consists. But this argument also is one of that kind which depend for their value upon the supposition of the thing to be proved.

In like manner, it is only by assuming that there can be no

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 5.

real presence of the Lord at the communion table but in the way set forth in the doctrine of transubstantiation—no communion or partaking of the body and blood of the Lord but by a literal eating of the one and drinking of the other, that any one can imagine any force in an argument from that expression *the cup* [or *chalice*] *of the Lord*. “St Paul believed in the real presence; for how could he call the chalice, the *chalice of the Lord*, if it were only a cup containing *common wine*?” The same remark applies to what follows. “And what would the unworthiness consist in, if only common bread and wine were present?” And how could the unworthy receiver be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, if the body and blood of the Lord were not therepresent?”<sup>1</sup> All this is in a strain very familiar to Popish controversialists, with whom arguments of this sort seem in high favour; and besides what has been quoted, Mr Keenan indulges in them at considerable length. “How could a man become unworthy by eating a morsel of bread and drinking a little wine, as a commemoration of the death of Christ?” &c., &c. These Popish theologians seem to think the commemoration of the death of Christ an easy enough thing,<sup>2</sup> and to have little re-

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> How low their estimate is of anything properly spiritual may be inferred from what we have already seen of the way of arguing on John vi., that if *only faith* had been intended, such strong expressions would not have been used. It will appear also from the following prayer, with its accompanying direction, taken from a book of devotion much in use:—

“Such as are not prepared to communicate *really* may communicate *spiritually*, by saying as follows:—

“Most loving Jesus, I adore thee with a lively faith, who art present in this Sacrament, by virtue of thine infinite power, wisdom, and goodness. But, *conscious of my infirmities and sins*, I DARE NOT NOW RECEIVE THEE SACRAMENTALLY. All my hope is in thee: I love thee, O Lord, with all my heart, who hast so loved me: and therefore I desire to receive thee now spiritually: come, therefore, O Lord to me in Spirit, and heal my sinful soul. Feed me, for I am hungry,” &c. &c.—*Key of Heaven*, 109, 110, —“*Prayers at Mass*.”

Here the reader will observe also the boast of perfection already animadverted upon. Yet this worshipper, who loves Jesus *with all his heart*, dare not receive him sacramentally! The inconsistencies of Popery are endless.



gard for the Lord's ordinance, considered merely as his ordinance.

Cardinal Wiseman argues somewhat differently from Mr Keenan on this topic, but to the same effect. "If the body of Christ be not really there," he says, "how can the offence be considered as directed against the body of Christ? It may be against his dignity or goodness, but surely it is not an offence against his body." And then he makes a fine display of learning on the phrase translated *guilty of*; all which we may pass over, noting only what he says at last, "This is a peculiar expression and perhaps may be illustrated by a similar form in the Roman law, where a man guilty of treason, or an offence against majesty, is simply called 'guilty of majesty' (*reus majestatis*),—that is, of an injury or offence against it. We see here that the unworthy receiver is guilty of the body, that is, of an offence against the body of Christ; but, as in the one case, if the majesty were not there, that crime could not be committed, so likewise, unless the body of our Saviour was here, to be unworthily approached, the abuse of the Eucharist could not be called an offence against it." It would seem, then, that Cardinal Wiseman cannot conceive of the crime of treason, except as committed when the sovereign is actually *there*—on the spot! Yet what if Christ be here, though not as Papists imagine? Surely, at all events, the illustration from *reus majestatis* fails.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, II., 215, 216. See also *Lectures on the Eucharist*, 283–288. But let me quote a few sentences from a better book:—"Take heed to the text: The text says not that they eat the body of Christ unworthily, but it says that they eat that bread and drink that wine unworthily; and yet, because they eat that bread and drink that wine unworthily, they are counted before God guilty of the body and blood of Christ. Now, wherefore is this? Not because they receive him; for if they received him, they could not but receive him worthily; for Christ cannot be received of any man but worthily. But they are counted guilty of the body and blood of the Son of God, because they refused him: for when they did eat that bread and drink that wine, they might, if they had had faith, have eaten and drunken the flesh and blood of Christ Jesus."—(Bruce, *Works*, 51; Wodrow Society. I have modernised the spelling.)

The following concluding sentence from Mr Keenan presents another pleasant illustration of the Popish controversial style; "If the Catholic be the true doctrine—if the body and blood of Christ are truly and really present—then are all St Paul's words intelligible and full of meaning; but in the Protestant sense, they are the most unintelligible gibberish that ever was uttered."<sup>1</sup> Similar to this are some of the same gentleman's remarks in comparing the manna of the desert with the "Christian Sacrament of the Eucharist," of which, like many other Papists, he states it to have been a type—coolly taking for granted that Protestants must admit this also, whereas it is in no way consistent with their doctrine, and they must rather hold that the manna and the sacramental bread are both to be accounted figures of Christ, and not the one the figure of the other.

"If the Protestant bread and wine be the Christian Pasch, then the figure is greater than the reality, and Christianity is degraded even below the level of the Judaic rite. The manna was miraculous bread; the Protestant Sacrament is natural bread. The manna came from on high; the Protestant Sacrament came from the earth or the baker's oven."

And so on; for Mr Keenan is capable of pouring forth a ready torrent of this description of eloquence,—as Cardinal Wiseman excels in multiplying words which conceal the subject, and pretending to argue when he is only bewildering his readers. But Mr Keenan might have remembered that the baker's oven is called into requisition by the Church of Rome likewise, and that she is more particular than Protestant Churches about the flour to be employed. And when he by and bye condemns the Protestant Sacrament for being corruptible at all times, and having no miraculous qualities, he surely forgets that the *accident* of corruptibility remains with his own; nor need he wonder if we turn away with contempt from the boast of miraculous qualities, which none of our senses can discern. But nothing is too preposterous for the man who can gravely quote the case of Lot's wife as an instance of transubstantiation,<sup>2</sup>—an instance which

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxiv., sect. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, *Cat. of Chr. Rel.*, II., 33.



would only have been to the purpose, if she had gone about, walking and speaking, and seeming to be a woman, after she was changed into a pillar of salt.

Popery had once an easier way of disposing of all the arguments from Paul, by making him at once to say what it was judged that he ought to have said. In 1686, a French version of the New Testament by the divines of Lorraine was published at Bourdeaux, with approbation and permission, in which, amongst many other perversions, the following occur:—

- 1 Cor. xi. 26. "As often as ye eat this *living* bread [*ce pain vivant*].
27. "Whosoever shall eat this bread *of life* [*de vie*].
28. "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *live* bread [*ce pain vif*]."<sup>1</sup>

"We naturally must desire, on a question like this," says Cardinal Wiseman, "to ascertain the sentiments of antiquity."<sup>2</sup> And forthwith he proceeds to quotations from the fathers, and inferences from the *Discipline of the Secret*. In like manner, the other advocates of Popery in general, shew all willingness to get away from Scripture to Tradition. Here, however, I shall not attempt to follow them. For the same reason as in dealing with former subjects, I have refrained from examining or even exhibiting the Popish arguments from antiquity, I must refrain now,—because the argument is of a kind altogether incompetent for the purpose which it is produced to serve,—and because it would require a very large space to enter into the history and examine the growth of error, and a very large space also to shew the unfairness of great part of the quotations which are made in its support.

When hard pressed for arguments on the subject of transubstantiation, Papists sometimes take refuge in the evidence of miracles, of which a vast number may be found recorded in

<sup>1</sup> Collette's Romanism in England Exposed, 59.

<sup>2</sup> Lectures on the Principal Doctrines, II., 219.

their books. For a long time this sort of argument was very commonly employed, as most conclusive and convenient.

"A book was published by Toussain Bridoul, a Jesuit," says Dr Cunningham, "and certified by the competent authority at Lille, in 1672, to be 'taken out of Catholic authors, and to contain nothing contrary to faith or manners,' entitled, 'A Collection of Miracles of the Consecrated Wafer, grounded on the respects and acknowledgments which beasts, birds, and insects, on several occasions have rendered to it.' It consists of a long series of most ridiculous stories, taken from Popish authors, some of them canonized, of miracles wrought by, or in connection with the host. It was then reckoned sound logic, that since bees, spiders, and frogs, hens, ducks, and pigeons, lambs, goats, and wolves, asses, horses, and elephants, had all adored the host,—as was of course, satisfactorily proved, and devoutly believed,—men should follow their example."<sup>1</sup>

Specimens of this book may be seen in Gavin's Master Key to Popery, from which some of them have been copied by other authors. One only shall be given here,—to illustrate the quality of the whole.

"P. Orlandi, in his History of the Society, (*tom. 1, lib. 2, No. 27,*) says, that in the sixteenth century, within the Venetian territories, a priest carrying the holy host, without pomp or train, to a sick person, he met, out of the town, asses going to their pasture; who perceiving by a certain sentiment, what it was which the priest carried, they divided themselves into two companies on each side of the way, and fell on their knees. Whereupon the priest, with his clerk, all amazed, passed between those peaceable beasts, which then rose up, as if they would make a pompous show in honour of their Creator; followed the priest as far as the sick man's house, where they waited at the door till the priest came out from it, and did not leave him till he had given them his blessing. Father Simon Rodriguez, one of the first companions of St Ignatius, who then travelled in Italy, informed himself carefully of this matter, which happened a little while before our first Fathers came into Italy, and found that all had happened as has been told."

It is sickening to read page after page of such stories, where

<sup>1</sup> Notes to Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract., 126.



silliness and profanity are both so monstrous. Common sense and religious feeling are equally outraged. Oh, what guilt have those incurred who have thus presented religion in an aspect at once ridiculous and odious! How much are they to blame for the prevalence of irreligion and of atheism! But Popery, even when cautious about bringing forward her stories of miracles, has never been ashamed of their folly, nor repented of their wickedness. It may be said, that these things belonged all to the dark ages. And if it were so, and if these ages were dark, what must be thought of Popery? But in the "Catholic Christian Instructed," a book at the present day largely circulated, and used as a manual by many Papists in this country, we find the following sentences:—

"Both ancient and modern history furnish us with many instances of the best attested miracles, which from time to time have been wrought in testimony of this sacred truth; of which in divers parts of Christendom, there are standing monuments to this day. It would be too tedious to descend to particulars, and so much the less necessary, because all the miracles of Jesus Christ himself, as they prove that he could not be a liar, so they demonstrate that what he gives us in this Sacrament is verily and indeed his body and blood, as he has so clearly told us."<sup>1</sup>

Dr Challoner did not think it convenient or prudent to bring forward the stories about the bees, and hens, and asses: but he had no scruple in referring to them as "best attested miracles," and no scruple in comparing them with the miracles of Jesus Christ himself, about whom and whose miracles at the same time he wrote in language that may almost be held to indicate a mind maddened by the error which he was engaged in defending. But let the miracles of Jesus and these miracles of the "Sacred Host" be compared: and infidelity itself, unless quite as dishonest and as infatuated as Popery, will be ashamed to use the argument which Popish doctors have prepared for its hand.

In not producing any examples of the class of miracles to which he referred, Bishop Challoner exercised a caution which

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, Cath. Chr. Instr., ch. v., sect. 3.

marked the policy of the advocates of Popery in general for a considerable period, at least in those countries in which Protestant light prevailed. But either because Papists shrewdly judge that in these days, Protestant light is less to be dreaded, or because their own infatuation has increased, there has begun of late to be a recurrence to the former policy of their mediaeval predecessors. In the life of St Rose of Lima, we read, after much inflated language, about "what passed in her interior," and the joy which she experienced when she received the "Divine Sacrament,"—that she declared to her confessors,—

"—that she found in it an entire satiety; and that she derived from it so extraordinary a strength, that though before communion she was quite weak from fasting, and from the loss of the blood which she drew from her veins by disciplines, so that she was sometimes obliged to rest in the middle of the church, not being able to go as far as the altar without taking breath, she went from the holy table with the same strength as the prophet Elias felt after having eaten bread baked in the ashes, which was the symbol of the blessed Eucharist, [!!!], and of the strength which it communicates to those who receive it. After communion she felt a certain vigour, which so completely recruited her exhausted strength that she was able to return home without difficulty."<sup>1</sup>

But in the volume of Lives of Saints, already frequently quoted, and of which Cardinal Wiseman is the editor, we have, besides many miracles of other kinds, the following account of a miracle of the kind at present in question. It has the advantage of attesting not only the doctrine of transubstantiation in general, but even with regard to the parts or particles of the Sacrament. The contemptible silliness creates a feeling almost of

<sup>1</sup> Lives of St Rose of Lima, &c., 99, 100. I may perhaps be told that it is not fair to make this use of the volume from which I have just quoted. Some of our British Papists are evidently, if not ashamed of its grossness, at least doubtful of the prudence of publishing it as yet. Accordingly, in *Dolman's Magazine* for September 1848, we have a review of it, in which Mr Faber is taken very severely to task for the publication, and especially with regard to the austerities which St Rose is represented as having practised. "Why resuscitate such charnel horrors?" the reviewer very pertinently asks, and expresses his trust, as an English Catholic, that such austerities are not approved of or even sanctioned by the Church,—besides



shame in the very reading or transcribing of it: but the Cardinal puts it before us with all seriousness. It occurs in the Life of St Veronica Giuliani, whose baptismal name was Ursula.

"When she was about four years of age her mother fell so dangerously ill that the Viaticum was brought to her. The moment the priest entered the house, Ursula saw such a bright light surrounding him, that she ran to him, and earnestly begged to receive the blessed Sacrament. To keep her quiet, she was told that there were no more particles left; but she at once answered, that he might safely break a portion off that intended for her mother, because as the mirror, when broken, does not cease to reflect the images that it represented when entire, so is Jesus equally present in the smallest fragment as well as in the entire host from which it has been separated. As soon as her mother had communicated, she sprang upon the bed, exclaiming, 'O what sweet things you have had!' and coming near her mouth, she said, 'O what a sweet scent!' Nor could the attendants succeed in making her leave her mother in peace."<sup>1</sup>

Such is the evidence by which Cardinal Wiseman recommends this doctrine to those who care to read the Lives of Saints, though he does not yet make use of it in his Lectures.

"We adore the Saviour mysteriously present in the Sacrament," signifying a doubt of the truth of the narrative. But in the first chapter of the present work, where Mr Faber's volume is quoted on the subject of Popish austerities, quotations are also made from the Lives edited by Cardinal Wiseman, and the reader may be left to decide whether any English "Catholic" can reasonably receive the one volume as containing sound instruction or exhibiting praiseworthy examples whilst yet he rejects the other. Besides, Mr Faber's work comes forth under such patronage and sanction as English "Catholics" cannot surely make light of. Concerning the miracles in Father Faber's volume, and of which that above quoted is, after all, one of the least notable, the reviewer passes them over with less expression of disapproval. "We are not denying their truth," he says, "though with regard to some, we certainly suspend our judgment." It is well that English Papists should have credit given them for any appearance of such common sense, in any of their number, as revolts at the monstrosities which their leaders, however, recommend to their belief, their admiration, and their imitation. It is to be hoped that the reviewer's expressions of dislike are sincere, and not a mere device of Jesuitical policy.

<sup>1</sup> Lives of Saints of 26 May 1839; p. 226.

ment," says Dr Moehler, "rejoice in his exceeding condescending compassion; and express, in canticles of praise and thanksgiving, our pious emotions, as far as the divinely enraptured soul of man can express them. Out of this faith sprung the mass, which in its essential purport, is as old as the Church, and even in its more important forms can be proved to have been already in existence in the second and third centuries."<sup>1</sup>

It results naturally from the doctrine of transubstantiation that the priest who celebrates mass should be regarded as offering a true sacrifice to God. And this, which might seem to a Christian a consequence so monstrous, and so contrary to the whole scheme and spirit of the gospel as to suggest a powerful argument against the doctrine, is actually adduced by Papists as a consideration strongly in its favour. The Church must have a sacrifice; and where is the sacrifice of the Christian Church, or where can it be but in the mass? So they reason; and to the sacrifice of the mass the doctrine of transubstantiation is indispensable. Popish writers continually exult over us Protestants that their Church has a sacrifice, but the Protestant Church has none,—that the Protestant Church is therefore according to its own doctrine far inferior to the Jewish,—and that the absence of sacrifice is fatal to the Protestant system of doctrine, because sacrifice has always been the principal part of worship since the beginning of the world.

Their ablest writers represent the Protestant objections to the doctrine of the mass as indicative of what they reckon the deepest and most fundamental errors of Protestantism.

"As this view is so obvious," says Dr Moehler, when he has stated this doctrine in a form as plausible as ever it was made to assume, "and as the Reformers nevertheless continually repeated their objections, and impressed them so strongly on the minds of their followers, that, down to the present day they are repeated, something deeply rooted in the constitution of Protestantism itself seems to lurk under these objections, and requires to be dragged to light. The decisive, conscious, undoubting faith, that Christ before our eyes offers himself up for us

<sup>1</sup> Moehler, Symbolism, I., 334, 335.



to his eternal Father, is quite calculated to produce an effect piercing into the inmost heart of man—far below the deepest roots of evil, so that sin in its inmost germ should be plucked from the will, and the believer be unable to refuse to consecrate his life to God. THIS ORDINANCE OF DIVINE COMPASSION NECESSARILY LEADS ALONG WITH OTHERS, TO THE DOCTRINE OF INTERNAL JUSTIFICATION; AS ON THE OTHER HAND THE MASS MUST BE REJECTED WITH A SORT OF INSTINCT, WHEREVER THAT DOCTRINE IS REPUDIATED. If such great and living manifestations of the Redeemer's grace be unable thoroughly to purify the heart of man; if they be incapable of moving us to heartfelt gratitude and mutual love, to the most unreserved self-sacrifice, and to the supplication, that God would accept the oblation of ourselves; THEN WE MAY WITH REASON DESPAIR OF OUR SANCTIFICATION, AND ABANDON OURSELVES TO A MERE THEORY OF IMPUTATION."<sup>1</sup>

Thus are we brought back again, by the reasonings of this Popish doctor himself to our starting point,—the difference betwixt the Protestant Church and the Church of Rome in the doctrine of justification.

Ere proceeding to illustrate these Popish views by further quotations, I must pause, though but for a moment, to advert to the spiritual darkness manifested, and the utter ignorance even of the first elements of Christian truth. Dr Moehler, it will be observed, plainly acknowledges the inconsistency of the Popish mass with the doctrine of justification by any other than an inherent righteousness. Cardinal Wiseman also represents it as restoring "moral life" to man by the communication of internal grace.<sup>2</sup> But the argument from Jewish and patriarchal sacrifices, is calculated to affect us more than even such statements, as exhibiting a total misapprehension of Christianity. The Jewish and the patriarchal sacrifices were mere types, and the offering of sacrifice has ceased, and with it all true priesthood in this lower world, because now the sacrifice has been offered which is the antitype of these, and Jesus Christ "by one offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,"<sup>3</sup> and "by his own blood hath entered in once into the holy place, having obtained

<sup>1</sup> Moehler, Symbolism, I., 346, 347. (I have introduced the small capitals.)

<sup>2</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, &c., II., 235, 236.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. x, 14.

eternal redemption for us."<sup>1</sup> But we are not without a priest;—we have one who is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities,"<sup>2</sup> and "in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, is able to succour them that are tempted."<sup>3</sup> We need no other sacrifice, because this has for ever satisfied the justice of God,—we need no other priest, because this Great High Priest "ever liveth to make intercession for us," and "is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him,"<sup>4</sup> and "if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."<sup>5</sup> What then could another priest do for us?—a sinful mortal priest! To attempt any other sacrifice is to disparage the sacrifice of Christ, and to set up any other priest is to make light of the priesthood of Christ, whilst at the same time it is impiously to invade an office peculiarly and exclusively his. And an earthly priesthood, instead of being as Papists represent it, a distinguishing excellency of their Church, is in plainest opposition to that in which the very glory of the Christian dispensation consists. We are taught to rejoice that there is none but Christ betwixt us and God, and that we have all freedom of access to God through him. The ordinance of priesthood implies some imperfection in those who require a priest to interpose betwixt them and God; for why should they seek his assistance if they could approach God, and were warranted in approaching him for themselves? We grant the imperfection, and our need of assistance: but we rejoice that no mere human being comes into this important place, or stands to us in the relation in which he who fills it must necessarily stand. So soon as a mere human priesthood is interposed betwixt man and God, the worshipper is necessarily to a great extent dependent upon his fellow-mortal and fellow-sinner. Viewing the whole system, moreover, as a base invention, we readily find in it an explanation of all the bondage and debasement of the human mind which have ever marked the prevalence of Popery.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix, 12.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. iv, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. ii, 18.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. vii, 25.

<sup>5</sup> 1 John ii, 1.

<sup>6</sup> We may leave Papists and Puseyites to settle the question between



"The main design of this discourse," says Owen, in his animadversions on a treatise entitled *Fiat Lux*, "is to cry up the sacrifice that Catholics have in their churches, but not the Protestants. This sacrifice, he tells us, was 'the sum of all apostolical devotion, which Protestants have abolished.' Strange! that in all the writings of the Apostles, there should not be one word mentioned of that which was the sum of their devotion!"<sup>1</sup> But we need not to go back to the seventeenth century. Let us look to a few more passages from Protestant authors of the present day, or from those whose works are at the present day most extensively circulated. The following is from the Most Rev. Dr James Butler's Catechism.

"Why did Christ give to the priests of his Church so great a power," [as that of transubstantiation]?

"That his children, throughout all ages and nations, might have a most acceptable sacrifice to offer to their Heavenly Father, and the most precious food to nourish their souls.

"What is a sacrifice?

"The first and most necessary act of religion, whereby we acknowledge God's supreme dominion over us, and our total dependence on him.

"What is the sacrifice of the New Law?

"The mass.

"Was the mass offered in the Old Law?

"No; so great a sacrifice was reserved for the New Law, which was to fulfil the figures of the Old, and to give religion its full perfection."<sup>2</sup>

themselves as they can about the right of ministers of the Church of England to be called priests. The following sentences are from a work by the well-known Dr MacHale of Tuam.

"Protestants labour much to prove the perpetuity of the priesthood and the validity of its orders. A priesthood without a sacrifice is an anomaly in language which cannot be explained. They are correlative words which express correlative duties, and of which the one can never be dissociated from the other. . . . Such a priesthood would be as anomalous a character as a king without any regal authority, or as a judge without any judicial functions. . . . But, to be consistent, it is necessary to believe in the sacrifice of the mass, or to annihilate altogether the existence of a Christian priesthood."—(Evidences and Doctrines, 451.)

<sup>1</sup> Owen, works, (new ed.) XIV., 117.

<sup>2</sup> The Most Rev. Dr James Butler's Cat., Lesson xxvi.

Here, besides what these questions and answers are quoted to exhibit, it will be observed how the mass is made a distinguishing glory of the New Testament dispensation, as if it were the antitype of Old Testament types, and the substance of these shadows.

But Dr James Butler, writing for the lowest Irish in Ireland, does not go farther in all this, than Dr Milner or Mr Keenan. The former of these authors, speaking of *sacrifice*, says—

"The tradition of this primitive ordinance, and the notion of its advantageousness, have been so universal, that it has been practised, in one form or other, in every age, from the time of our first parents, down to the present, and by every people, whether civilized or barbarous, except modern Protestants."

Afterwards he says,—

"From the whole of this, I infer, that it would have been truly surprising, if, under the most perfect dispensation of God's benefits to men, the New Law, he had left them destitute of sacrifice."<sup>1</sup>

And Mr Keenan says,—

"The Protestant Church has no *altar*, or *priest*, or *sacrifice*; all of which, according to the Scripture, are clearly necessary in the true Christian Church."<sup>2</sup>

Again, in another work, speaking of the Jewish sacrifices, he says—

"What did the bloody sacrifices of the Jews signify?

"The sacrifice of the cross, on which Jesus Christ shed his blood.

"What did the unbloody Jewish sacrifices prefigure?

"They are regarded as a figure of the holy sacrifice of the mass, which takes place without the effusion of blood. . . .

" . . . The peace sacrifice and the sacrifice for sin, [of individuals,] represented the sacrifice of the mass. . . .

"What was represented by the sacrifice of fine flour?

"The sacrifice of the mass, in which Jesus is offered without the effusion of blood, under the appearances of bread and wine. The oil and incense mixed with the flour, represented the unction of the Holy Spirit, of

<sup>1</sup> Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xl.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, Contr. Cat., ch. xxvi., sect. 1.



which Jesus Christ, represented by the flour, was full; it represented also prayer, without which no offering can be agreeable to God.

"What signified the sacrifice of the emissary goat?

"The sacrifice of the mass . . . &c., &c.

"Do we find in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ all that we have observed in the ancient sacrifices?

"Yes; all are realised in the sacrifice of the mass . . . " &c., &c.<sup>1</sup>

The question so naturally arises, If the mass be a sacrifice, what was the precise value of the sacrifice of Christ? It is so obvious that this part of Popish doctrine interferes with the soul's entire reliance on his one sacrifice, that Popish theologians have had recourse to one of their usual refinements and ingenious inventions in order to harmonize the apparent inconsistency. They represent the sacrifice of the mass as the same sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross,—not another, but the same. Thus Dr Milner endeavours to shew that the doctrine of the mass is perfectly agreeable to that taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as to the excellency of Christ's sacrifice over the sacrifices of the Jewish law, in that they needed to be often repeated, whereas "Christ's death on the cross *obliterated at once* the sins of those who availed themselves of it." "Such," he says, "is the argument of St Paul to the Jews respecting their sacrifices, which in no sort militates against the sacrifice of the mass, this being the same sacrifice with that of the cross as to the victim that is offered, and as to the priest who offers it,—differing in nothing but the manner of offering, in the one there being a real, in the other a mystical effusion of Christ's blood."<sup>2</sup> Bossuet had already softened the doctrine still more when he said, "The Church is so far from believing that anything is wanting to the sacrifice of the cross, that she deems it, on the contrary, so perfectly and so fully sufficient, that whatever is afterwards added has been instituted to celebrate its memory and to apply its virtue. We acknowledge that all the merit of the redemption is

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 171–173.

<sup>2</sup> Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xl. In this he for the most part adopts the words of the Council of Trent, sess. xxii., c. ii.

derived from the death of the Son of God; when, therefore, in the celebration of the divine mysteries, we say, 'We offer to thee this holy victim,' we pretend not by this oblation to make or to present to God a new payment of the price of our salvation, but to offer to him, in our behalf, the merits of Jesus Christ present, and that infinite price which he once paid for us upon the cross."<sup>1</sup> But the Council of Trent asserts that the sacrifice of the mass is "truly propitiatory,"<sup>2</sup>—and it is difficult to perceive how Bossuet's exposition agrees with the idea of a true propitiation by that sacrifice. Mr Keenan and others surely imagine that there is something more than a mere *offering* in the *sacrifice* of the mass, when they labour to make out that there is in it something,—namely, the transubstantiation of the elements,—which may be regarded as equivalent to the *destruction* of the thing offered, which they represent as an essential part in other sacrifices. "Why do you say," asks Mr Keenan in one of his catechisms, "that some change or destruction must take place in the thing offered?" And he thus commences his reply: "To distinguish the sacrifice, properly so called, from a simple offering."<sup>3</sup>

Moehler presents the usual solution of this difficulty, but in the most ingenious form that I have seen.

"Christ on the Cross, has offered the sacrifice for our sins. But the incarnate Son of God, who hath suffered, died, and risen again from the dead for our sins, living according to his own teaching, is present in the Eucharist, the Church from the beginning hath, at His command, (Luke xxii., 20,) substituted the Christ mysteriously present, and visible only to the spiritual eye of faith, for the historical Christ, now inaccessible to the corporeal senses. The former is taken for the latter, because the latter is likewise the former,—both are considered as one and the same, and the Eucharistic Saviour, therefore, as the victim also for the sins of the world. And the more so, as, WHEN WE WISH TO EXPRESS OURSELVES ACCURATELY THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST ON THE CROSS IS PUT ONLY AS A PART FOR AN

<sup>1</sup> Bossuet, Exposition de la Doct. Cathol., sect. xiv., quoted and translated in Berington and Kirk, 290.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Trid., sess. xxii., c. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 161. & 1



ORGANIC WHOLE. FOR HIS WHOLE LIFE ON EARTH, HIS MINISTRY AND SUFFERINGS, AS WELL AS HIS PERPETUAL CONDESCENSION TO OUR INFIRMITY IN THE EUCHARIST, CONSTITUTE ONE GREAT SACRIFICIAL ACT, ONE MIGHTY ACTION UNDERTAKEN OUT OF LOVE FOR US, AND EXPIATORY OF OUR SINS, CONSISTING, INDEED, OF VARIOUS INDIVIDUAL PARTS, YET SO THAT NONE BY ITSELF IS STRICTLY SPEAKING THE SACRIFICE. In each particular part the whole recurs, yet without these parts the whole cannot be conceived. The will of Christ, to manifest His gracious condescension to us in the Eucharist, forms no less an integral part of his great work, than all besides, and in a way so necessary, indeed, that whilst we here find the whole scheme of redemption reflected, WITHOUT IT THE OTHER PARTS WOULD NOT HAVE SUFFICED FOR OUR COMPLETE ATONEMENT. Who, in fact, would venture the assertion that the descent of the Son of God in the Eucharist belongs not to His general merits which are imputed to us?<sup>1</sup> Hence the sacramental sacrifice is A TRUE SACRIFICE—A SACRIFICE IN THE STRICT SENSE, yet so that it must in no wise be separated from the other things which Christ hath achieved for us, as the very consideration of the end of its institution will clearly show. In this last portion (if we may so call it) of the great sacrifice for us, all the other parts are to be present, and applied to us; in this last part of the objective sacrifice, the latter becomes subjective and appropriated to us. Christ on the cross is still an object strange to us; Christ, in the Christian worship, is our property, our victim. There He is the universal victim—HERE HE IS THE VICTIM FOR US IN PARTICULAR, AND FOR EVERY INDIVIDUAL AMONGST US; there He was only the victim;—here He is the victim acknowledged and revered; there the objective atonement was consummated here the subjective atonement is partly fostered and promoted, partly expressed.”<sup>2</sup>

I have made this long quotation, because Dr Moehler seems to be generally acknowledged by Papists of the present day, both in this country and upon the Continent, as their greatest champion,—and also because the view here presented is ingeniously elaborated, and there is a shew of deep theology and systematizing philosophy. But let the reader consider the parts which, for convenience of this reference, I have distinguished

<sup>1</sup> I shall not venture to determine in what sense this author here uses this expression. But certainly not as acknowledging what we hold as the doctrine of *imputation*, against which he takes every opportunity of declaring.

<sup>2</sup> Moehler, Symbolism, I., 336, 339.

by capitals, and say whether those who adopt Dr Moehler's sentiments can any longer say with Paul, “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ!”<sup>1</sup> Let him consider also whether there can be any more decided opposition to the dying words of our Lord himself, “It is finished,” or to the argument of his Apostle, “Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again.”<sup>2</sup> Surely, if the Apostle had held any such doctrine as the great Bavarian Doctor states in the above-quoted paragraph, he could not but have introduced it here.

But Dr Moehler says, in the concluding words of his statement, that on the cross “the objective atonement was consummated, here [in the mass] the subjective atonement is partly fostered and promoted, partly expressed.” This is a mere loophole for escape from difficulty. The Papist sees that without some such qualifying observation, his views are stated in distinct denial of the consummation of an objective atonement on the cross. But the qualifying observation can avail nothing except with the totally inconsiderate, who are caught by the sound of such words as objective and subjective, and do not penetrate beyond them to the meaning. For what is an objective and what is a subjective atonement? If there be meaning in words the one is the mere effect of the other. An objective atonement is the only atonement in the proper sense of that term,—in that sense in which atonement is equivalent with propitiation. And it must be remembered that the Council of Trent has declared the mass to be a truly propitiatory sacrifice. Nay, we have only to look to some of Dr Moehler's own words in the passage above given, to see that its concluding words are at complete variance with its general import, and especially with the immediately preceding declaration which really exalts the alleged sacrifice of the mass above the sacrifice of the cross, saying, that “Here He [Christ] is the victim for us in particular, and for every individual amongst us.”

<sup>1</sup> Gal. vi., 14.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii., 34.



Dr MacHale tells us that—

“Those who pretend that the sacrifice of the mass is irreconcilable with the tenor of the Epistle which St Paul addressed to the Hebrews, take but a contracted view of his reasoning on the priesthood. If he insists on the eternity of Christ, the high-priest, it is to contrast it with the mortality of Aaron; and if he insists on the sufficient atonement of the sacrifice of the cross, once consummated, it is in reference to the imperfect oblations of the Old Law, frequently repeated.”<sup>1</sup>

But is not the very strength of the contrast gone, if the sacrifice of the New Law be alleged to require frequent repetition likewise? The Popish Archbishop goes on to argue that as there were priests or vicarious ministers under Aaron, so there may be priests or vicarious ministers under Christ, and says that—

“In offering the sacrifice of the Eucharist, priests are only Christ’s ministers, by presenting daily to his Eternal Father, the sacrifice which was once consummated on Calvary.”

And like Moehler and others, he wanders from one view of the subject to another, now saying that the mass is “a real as well as commemorative sacrifice,” and then immediately, that it is “commemorative, as it recalls the memory; and real, as it conveys the merits of the death of our Redeemer.” And again, “By the sacrifice of the cross, our ransom was paid; by that of the mass, the same ransom is applied.” But is it a true propitiatory sacrifice or not? For if it is, there is something more in it than a mere application of a ransom already paid. All this shuffling arises from the felt difficulty of reconciling the Trent doctrine with any decent acknowledgment of the excellency and sufficiency of the one sacrifice of Calvary.

And when we find it alleged, as it often is by Popish writers, that in the mass there is merely an offering to God of the same sacrifice which was made upon the cross, we might almost suppose that the language of Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews had been purposely chosen with a view to the most direct refutation of the error,—and the supposition becomes the more probable the more that we consider the importance of the subject, and the

<sup>1</sup> MacHale, *Evidences and Doctrines*, 455.

prescience of the Holy Ghost. “By one offering (μιά προσφορά), hath he perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”<sup>1</sup> Christ was not to “offer himself often,” (Οὐδ’ ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρει ἑαυτὸν),<sup>2</sup>—“for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world.” “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many,” (ἀπαξ προσεγενεχθεις).<sup>3</sup> And the word here employed by the Apostle, προσφέρω, is the very same that is employed by the Greek fathers, in many of those passages which Papists quote in their argument from tradition, and correctly or incorrectly, (as to which we need not at present concern ourselves), apply to the eucharist, or the mass.<sup>4</sup>

To the quotations already made may be added one from Mr Keenan:—

“Is there then more than one sacrifice propitiatory or expiatory? Has not the sacrifice of the cross alone expiated all sin?”

“The sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the altar are one and the same.”<sup>5</sup>

It is not easy to understand how the same victim should be offered time after time in sacrifice. To this there was certainly nothing analogous under the *Old Law*, as Popish theologians

<sup>1</sup> Heb. x., 14.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. ix., 25.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. ix., 28.

<sup>4</sup> Thus in quotations given by Berington and Kirk, the Council of Ancyra is made to speak of erring priests who are not to be allowed to offer (προσφέρειν), and the Council of Neocæsarea, that country priests in the presence of the Bishop, &c., cannot offer (προσφέρειν). The same expression is ascribed to the Council of Nice; the Popish controversialists giving us in all these cases, this Greek word as the important word of the passage. So also when the Council of Laodicea speaks of the holy offering (την ἁγίαν προσφοράν). So when St John Chrysostom says, according to their translation, “The offering is the same,” they give the Greek, Τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἅς προσφερομεν, and when Theodoret is made to say, “Christ is now the priest, according to the flesh born of Judah, not himself offering, but being the head of those that offer,” and when he is further quoted as saying, “The Church offers his body and blood.” Οὐκ αὐτὸς τι προσφέρειν, ἀλλὰ τῶν προσφεροντων κεφαλὴ χρηματιζων, and Προσφέρει δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία τὰ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος.

<sup>5</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxvi., sect. 2. See also Challoner, *Cath. Chr. Instr.*, ch. vi.



affect to call the Jewish dispensation. To suppose this repeated offering would seem to imply some imperfection in the first or principal offering. And indeed there is another difficulty here as to the offering of Christ's glorified body; for we must remember it is Christ's glorified body which is affirmed to be present under the inglorious accidents of bread and wine in the eucharist and mass. The difficulty which presents itself is not much removed, when Dr Milner tells us that in the one case there is "a real, and in the other a mystical effusion of Christ's blood." This seems very like mystification,—another of those shuffling evasions of which we have already seen instances. What is a mystical effusion of the blood of a sacrifice?—if, as we are told, the sacrifice of the mass be a true propitiatory sacrifice. What if a mystical effusion of blood should only procure a mystical remission of sins, and so the whole matter end in a mystical salvation, under the sensible accidents of damnation? Will any logic be found to soothe away the torments of hell-fire?

But sometimes it would seem as if the idea attached to the repetition of the mass were somewhat analogous to that of the efficacy which we ascribe to the intercession of Christ. This would seem to be very much the import of those statements already noticed, which make the sacrifice of the mass a mere application of the ransom paid upon the cross,—a subjective atonement,—statements at complete variance with the doctrine that the mass is a true propitiatory sacrifice, and with all, and it is not little, which is founded upon that doctrine. And thus Bishop Challoner,—who, in another place, himself draws the parallel betwixt the efficacy of this repetition and the efficacy of the intercession,<sup>1</sup>—in answer to the question "What need was there of the sacrifice of the altar, since we were fully redeemed by the sacrifice of the cross?" says, amongst other things, "That we might have in the sacrifice of the altar a standing memorial of the death of Christ;" and "That by the sacrifice of the altar,

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, Cath. Christ. Instr., ch. vi., near the end.

the fruit of his death might be daily applied to our souls."<sup>1</sup> And in like manner Mr Keenan,—

"Why, then, renew every day the same sacrifice? Is not the sacrifice of the cross, once offered, sufficient?"

"The merits and virtue of the sacrifice of the cross are infinite; but that virtue and these merits must be applied, and this can only be done by certain means."

And amongst these means, he assigns a very prominent place to the mass:—

"We are to regard it as a means employed by the Almighty for applying the sacred merits of the sacrifice of the cross to our souls, in a very particular manner."<sup>2</sup>

But all this is very far short of the doctrine that the sacrifice of the mass is a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead,—a doctrine which, if propounded, must surely make those who receive it trust to this alleged sacrifice in another way than if merely taught to view it as the means of applying the sacred merits of the sacrifice of the cross to their souls. The one degree of error is grosser than the other, whilst the one view is incompatible with the other. Yet the same theologians maintain both! and thus sink deeper in error than even if they maintained only the worst of them alone.

In the Douay Catechism,—of which a large quotation may be seen in the sixty-second number of the Protestant,—it "being calculated," as M<sup>r</sup> Gavin observes, "for the meridian of Scotland," the gross assertion is avoided that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, though that author shews that as much is implied. But Popery does not seem now to think it necessary to be so much upon its guard in Scotland, and Mr Keenan does not scruple to give forth the doctrine of Maynooth in terms sufficiently express:—

"Is the sacrifice of the mass a true propitiatory sacrifice?"

"Yes; both for the living and the dead."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, Cath. Christ. Instr., ch. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxvi., sect. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.



But Bishop Challoner also had adduced his texts to prove "that this sacrifice is propitiatory for obtaining the remission of our sins," though shortly afterwards he speaks of it as if it were a mere representation of the redeeming sacrifice of the cross.<sup>1</sup> Dr Milner makes a sustained endeavour to combine these two views into one, and in so doing he likens the sacrifice of the mass to the Jewish sacrifices, a comparison inconsistent with any just view of their character:—

"They had perpetual sacrifices of animals to represent the death of Christ, and to apply the fruits of it to their souls. In the same manner, Catholics have Christ really present, and mystically offered on their altars daily, for the same ends, but in a far more efficacious manner, and, of course, a true propitiatory sacrifice."<sup>2</sup>

Whether, after all, he has described a true propitiatory sacrifice we shall not stay to inquire, or whether he did not rather labour to disguise and soften down the doctrine of his Church.<sup>3</sup> But we may pause a moment to advert to the evident difference betwixt typical sacrifices and a sacrifice in which Christ himself is really present on the altar—the impossibility, therefore, of regarding the one in the same manner with the others—and the necessary rise of our thoughts from the Jewish sacrifices to a sacrifice really obtaining for us the remission of our sins.

It is not to be forgotten that the doctrine of the Council of Trent is quite decided on this subject, however modern theologians may try to soften or explain it. It may well provoke indignation to turn from that doctrine, as given even in the quotation made by Berington and Kirk, to their own *proposition*, professedly founded upon it. For the decree of the Council runs thus:—

"The holy Synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that, by it, to the sincerely penitent, the sins we commit, however enormous they be, are remitted. For it is one and the same victim, the same Christ now offering himself, by the ministry of the priest, who offered him-

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Milner, *End of Controversy*, Letter xl.

<sup>3</sup> See Dr Cunningham's *Notes on Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract.*, 271.

self on the cross, THE DIFFERENCE BEING ONLY IN THE MANNER OF THE OFFERING."<sup>1</sup>

By what vile Jesuitical process is this doctrine transmuted into the following?

"Our Saviour, in leaving to us his body and blood, under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a *Sacrament*, but also a *Sacrifice*; a commemorative sacrifice, distinctly shewing his passion and death until he come. For as the sacrifice of the cross was performed by a distinct *effusion* of his blood, so is that Sacrifice commemorated in this of the altar by a distinction of the symbols. Jesus, therefore, is here given not only to us, but for us; and the Church is thereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, usually termed the *Mass*: propitiatory, we say, because representing, in a lively manner, the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our Eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the Sacrifice of the cross."<sup>2</sup>

But the Jesuitism, in fact, exists in the decrees of the Council of Trent themselves, in which two very different views of the same subject are combined without being reconciled, and is in part to be ascribed to that wicked method of compromise so much adopted in the Council, in order to harmonise opposite opinions on points of the greatest importance. The perfection of the inconsistency to which it has led may perhaps be seen in Liguori, where he defines a *propitiatory* sacrifice to be "*expiatory*, for remission of guilt or of punishment (*"propitiatorium, seu expiatorium in remissionem culpæ vel pœnæ"*), and shortly afterwards says, the mass (a propitiatory sacrifice) was distinguished from the sacrifice of the cross "by its accidents as to the manner of offering" (*"accidentaliter, quoad modum offerendi"*), because "that was *meritorious*, and in it the price of our redemption was paid; but this is *not meritorious*, as here the merits of Christ are only applied." How, then, is it expiatory? Because by it God is moved to mercy.—(*"Expiatorium pecca-*

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Trid., Sess. xxii., c. ii., as quoted and translated by Berington and Kirk, 290. But there is even here a dishonest omission, of which further notice will presently be taken. Nor is the first sentence fairly and fully translated.

<sup>2</sup> Berington and Kirk, 263, 264.



*torum quia per illud Deus ad misericordiam movetur.*") Words are of no fixed or definite meaning when used by theologians of this class.<sup>1</sup>

Let us recur for a little to Mr Keenan, or to Scheffmacher, whom he here follows. Immediately after declaring that the mass is "a true propitiatory sacrifice both for the living and the dead," he proceeds thus:—

"In what sense is it a propitiatory sacrifice for the living?

"In this, that through it they obtain the spirit of compunction and grace to repent of their sins.

"How is it propitiatory for the dead?

"It contributes to the remission of the temporal punishment, which they may still owe to the divine justice."<sup>2</sup>

Now, this also looks very like explaining away,—especially the part relative to the living. But we may at least inquire, whether the mass may not be as helpful to the living as to the dead, in obtaining for them the remission of "*temporal* punishment." And that the living may not unreasonably expect something more by the sacrifice of the mass than to "obtain the spirit of compunction and grace to repent of their sins," is surely a fair inference from the comparison made of it to the sacrifices of the Jewish dispensation,—or from the words "truly propitiatory,"—or even from Liguori's statement that it is expiatory of sins, because by it God is moved to mercy. Here is a difference indeed. *Now* the sacrifice is propitiatory because it moves God to mercy; and *now* it is propitiatory, because it moves man to compunction, or obtains for him compunction and repentance! Concerning the sacrifices of the Jewish dispensation, we may listen again to Mr Keenan. We have already seen how in his Catechism of the Christian Religion, ("being with some small changes, a compendium of the Catechism of Montpellier,") he makes many of the Jewish sacrifices types of the mass; but he distinguishes from these the *Holocaust*, "the most perfect sacrifice," as representing "the complete and perfect sacrifice of Christ

<sup>1</sup> Liguori, *Theologia Moralis*, IV., 103.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxvi., sect. 2.

immolated on the cross, and consummated by his resurrection and ascension."<sup>1</sup> But in his *Controversial Catechism*, borrowing from another source, he gives a different account of the matter.

"How many kinds of sacrifices were there in the Old Law?

"There were four; the holocaust, the eucharistic, the impetratory, and the propitiatory sacrifices.

"For what end was the propitiatory sacrifice?

"To render God propitious, and to expiate sin.

"What says St Augustine?

"That the one sacrifice of the mass was instituted to hold the place of all the sacrifices of the Old Law."<sup>2</sup>

It would not be to our present purpose to inquire whether Augustine says the thing he is here made to say, or, if he uses the words, whether he uses them in any such sense. But here it is plain enough we have the true explanation of what is meant and ought to be understood when the sacrifice of the mass is called a proper and propitiatory sacrifice. It is intended "to render God propitious and to expiate sin." How could any man set this down, and then venture upon an attempt to explain it away? What are we to think of a Church committed both to the doctrine and the attempt?

This account of the matter agrees very thoroughly with what Bishop Challoner says in his *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, in which, having declared "the Catholic doctrine" that the mass is "a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead," and having defined a propitiatory sacrifice to mean "a sacrifice for obtaining mercy, or by which God is moved to mercy,"<sup>3</sup> he exclaims,—“Now what can more move God to

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *Cat. of Chr. Rel.*, II., 170.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxvi., sect. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See also Liguori, as above quoted. On a similar statement, M'Gavin well remarks, "There is an error in the last expression, distinct from the error of the mass sacrifice. . . . The minds of Papists are so estranged from the knowledge of the true God, that when they do speak of him, they speak of him as if he were an idol. . . . It is not true, even of the sacri-



mercy, than the oblation of his only Son there really present, and under this figure of death, representing to his Father that death which he suffered for us?"—Afterwards he asks,—

"What are the ends for which this sacrifice is offered to God?" and replies,—

... "3. In satisfaction for our sins through his [Christ's] blood."<sup>1</sup>

Can any thing be plainer than these last words? Only perhaps the words of the Council of Trent, which Berington and Kirk, pretending to quote its decree, have omitted from the midst of it without a hint or indication of such omission, in order to the better accomplishment of that Jesuitical transubstantiation of doctrine to which reference has already been made."<sup>2</sup> I must repeat one sentence of what was quoted already, giving a more complete translation than that which appears in the "Faith of Catholics."

"The holy Synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by means thereof this is effected—that we obtain mercy and seasonable aid if we draw nigh unto God, with a sincere heart and upright faith, with fear and reverence, contrite and penitent. FOR THE LORD, APPEASED BY THE OBLATION THEREOF, AND GRANTING THE GRACE AND GIFT OF PENITENCE, FORGIVES EVEN HEINOUS CRIMES AND SINS. For it is one and the same victim," &c., &c.<sup>3</sup>

Not only the Scriptures and the writings of the ancient fathers, but even the decrees of the Council of Trent are garbled by the controversialists of Rome, and misquoted as it suits their purpose!<sup>4</sup>

fice of Christ, that it moved God to mercy, or that it was necessary for the purpose. . . . God is in himself infinitely merciful; and it was in the mercy of God the Father that the salvation of sinners originated."—*Protestant*, No. 62.)

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *Grounds of Cath. Doct.*, ch. vi.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 274.

<sup>3</sup> "Hujus quippe oblatione placatus Dominus, gratiam et donum poenitentiae concedens, crimina et peccata etiam ingentia dimittit."—*Cone. Trid.*, sess. xxii., c. ii.

<sup>4</sup> As for the perversion of Scripture, the same French translation to which reference has already been made as giving such valuable support to

It is necessary that we should direct our attention for a little to the arguments which are advanced to maintain the doctrine that the mass is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice. One chief argument is from transubstantiation, although we have seen already that one argument *for* transubstantiation is from this very doctrine respecting the mass,—so that here we have another notable instance of reasoning in a circle.

"What proof have you that the mass is properly a sacrifice?" says Dr Challoner, and thus begins his reply:—

"Because, as we learn from many plain texts of Scripture quoted in the foregoing chapter, and from the perpetual tradition of the universal Church, in the consecration of the holy eucharist, the bread and wine are really changed into the body and blood of Christ; and consequently, in and by this consecration, the real body and blood of Christ our victim, which was for us immolated upon the cross, are in the mass exhibited and presented to God. Therefore the mass is properly a sacrifice, and the same sacrifice as that which Christ offered upon the cross."<sup>1</sup>

Here, it may be remarked, the argument is as false as the premises and conclusion are erroneous. Even upon the grounds here stated by Dr Challoner, it would not follow that the mass is properly a sacrifice; for the immolation would still be wanting. And this indeed has been always one of the points most perplexing to Popish theologians, to determine precisely when and how the sacrifice of the mass is made. It does not much aid us to the comprehension of their doctrine, to be told that Christ "dies mystically, inasmuch as his death is represented in consecrating apart the bread and wine, to denote the shedding of his sacred blood apart from his body at the time of his death," or that he "dies mystically in the separate consecration of the two different species."<sup>2</sup> The bread and wine indeed, it

transubstantiation, does the same service to the mass, by rendering Acts xiii. 2, "*As they offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the Mass*," (Comme ils offroient au Seigneur le sacrifice de la Messe,) the word MESSE being printed in large capitals, and the contents of the chapter announcing *Le Sacrifice de la Messe*.—(Collette, *Romanism in England Exposed*, 59.)

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *Cath. Chr. Instr.*, ch. vi.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*



is said, are *destroyed* "by the consecration of them into the body and blood of Christ,"<sup>1</sup>—but the question still remains, When is that body sacrificed? Mr Keenan appears to hold that it is in the consecration, agreeing in this with Dens, Liguori, and other theologians of similar high repute. "For the bread and wine," he says, "are in a *manner destroyed*; that is, they are changed into the body and blood of Christ, just as formerly the perfumes were destroyed by fire, to produce the incense or smoke, which was principally offered to God as an agreeable odour."<sup>2</sup> The just as in this argument is rather hard to follow. But Mr Keenan's readers might have been allowed to know the different opinions of doctors who differ upon this question; for even Dens and Liguori give the other opinions, whilst they prefer this as the more probable; and Liguori having stated the question, "In what consists the essence of the sacrifice of the mass?" begins his reply by saying, "This is a great question amongst the doctors; for there are several opinions."<sup>3</sup> So that the point is probably reserved for exercise of the infallibility of some future Pope.

But the opinion thus adopted leads St Alphonsus Liguori, and others who think along with him, to inquire in the next place, Whether the consecration of *both* species is essentially requisite to the sacrifice,—a question into which I shall not follow them farther than to remark that they generally decide it in the affirmative.<sup>4</sup>

A curious question also arises about the bread and wine. What becomes of them? We are told that they are *destroyed*. Is then the substance of them annihilated? If not, whither is it transferred? But this is perhaps a philosophical or scientific rather than a theological difficulty. However, it illustrates the impossibility of reconciling at all points theological error even with philosophical or scientific truth.

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, *Cat. of Chr. Rel.*, II., 177.

<sup>3</sup> Liguori, *Theol. Moralis*, IV., 104; and see Dens, *Theol.*, V., 365.

<sup>4</sup> See Dens and Liguori, as above. See also Challoner, as last quoted.

But, after what has just been quoted, Bishop Challoner proceeds:—

"And that this sacrifice is propitiatory for obtaining the remission of our sins we learn from the very words of Christ our Lord, at the first institution of it at his Last Supper; when in the consecration of the elements, speaking in the present tense, he tells us (as his words are in the original Greek,) *This is my body which shall be delivered for you*; 1 Cor. xi., 24. *This is my blood, of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many*; St Mat. xvi., 28; St Mark xiv., 24; or *This (cup) is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for many*, viz., for the remission of sins."<sup>1</sup>

Thus also Mr Keenan:—

"How do you prove that the mass is truly a propitiatory sacrifice?"

"From Matt. xxvi.: '*This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for remission for sins*;' and from Heb. v. '*For every high priest, taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins*.'"<sup>2</sup>

Mr Keenan, however, in adducing these texts as connected with the mass, inevitably commits himself to the extremest view of the alleged sacrifice, going far beyond what he had asserted almost immediately before concerning its efficacy with regard either to the living or the dead. But as to the argument, we can only wonder at its weakness. And what shall we say to the commentary which he elsewhere gives of the words of institution respecting the cup,—a commentary which must be received as just, in order that the argument above quoted may be supposed to have any force?

"From these passages [the words of our Lord as recorded by the evangelists] it is quite clear that the chalice contained what was shed for us; but what was shed for us was the blood of Christ; therefore the chalice contained the blood of Christ. But at the time of the Last Supper, Christ had not yet shed his blood for us in the sacrifice of the cross; therefore he shed it in the sacrifice of his Last Supper; therefore, in his Last Supper, Christ offered in sacrifice his body which was broken, his blood which was shed for the remission of our sins; therefore, he offered a true and real propitiatory sacrifice in his Last Supper."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxvi., sect. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xxvi., sect. 1.



This leads us to a passing notice of a curious and interesting point. There has been difference of opinion in the Popish Church, as to whether our Saviour offered the sacrifice of the mass on the eve of his betrayal. It is no wonder that wherever common sense survives at all, even its feeblest energies should be aroused to an indignant protest against such a monstrous opinion as that asserted by Mr Keenan (who here also follows Scheffmacher), in the last quoted sentence, or in the following question and answer :—

“Did Jesus Christ offer his body and blood for us to his Father in the Last Supper?”

“He did, not only upon the cross, but in his Last Supper.”<sup>1</sup>

On this point, Berington and Kirk go as far as Mr Keenan. For, quoting the words of institution, they say,—

“According to the translation of these passages, which is conformable to the Greek, our Saviour speaks in the present tense (or time) of the actual immolation of his body, and the actual effusion of his blood, for the remission of sins; because at that moment he really but *mystically* offered up his body and blood for the salvation of the apostles and of all men: while the words, *Do this for a commemoration, or in remembrance of me*, plainly denote the institution of a sacrifice to be celebrated to the end of time. Thus Christ seems to say: As I now immolate my body, and shed my blood, for the remission of sins; so do you offer up this same body, and this same blood, in remembrance of me.”<sup>2</sup>

But however confidently Scheffmacher and others of the Jesuit schools may determine this point, a different opinion has to some extent prevailed in the Church of Rome, and even in the Council of Trent it was argued that if that at the Last Supper was a true propitiatory sacrifice, then that upon the cross could be only in remembrance of this, and after much keen debate the doctrine was set down in these words,—“that at the

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Berington and Kirk, 265. Mr Keenan also in his Catechism of the Christian Religion (II. 175) says, “The uniform use by all who relate the institution of the *present time*, proves beyond cavil that Christ *actually then* and *there* did offer a real sacrifice; for, surely, to give his body and shed his blood was a true and propitiatory sacrifice.”

Last Supper Christ offered himself for a sacrifice,” without saying whether propitiatory or eucharistical,<sup>1</sup>—a shuffling and dishonest compromise—a trick for the maintenance of that worthless *sham* which the Church of Rome vaunts of as her *unity*.

There must, however, be a general agreement amongst Popish theologians, in deriving an argument for the true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice of the mass from the words of institution, for the Council of Trent fulminated its anathema against all *who should say that in the words, “Do this in remembrance of me,” Christ did not constitute his apostles priests*; and Papists know how to argue, as we have seen, on the invariable relation subsisting betwixt priesthood and sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> But the argument from the words of institution is founded chiefly upon the word translated *do*—(“Do this in remembrance of me”)—which word in the Latin Vulgate is *Facite*, and the verb *Facere* is sometimes used to signify the performing of sacrificial rites. Even in the Council of Trent, indeed, the rational opinion was expressed that when Christ said “*Hoc facite*,” “*Do this*,” he must have simply intended the *doing* of that which his disciples then saw him do. But on this point it is perhaps unnecessary at present to dwell, for, in so far as I have observed, modern Popish writers in this country are rather cautious of what they say regarding it, and do not give the argument any great prominence.<sup>3</sup>

But a favourite proof that the mass is a true sacrifice is derived from Mal. i. 11. The Council of Trent has given its authoritative sanction to this argument likewise. “This is the clean offering which the prophet Malachi foretold should be offered in every place.” For ordinary use, the controversialists of our time seem to prefer this argument to that last noticed. Dr Milner employs it, and Berington and Kirk.<sup>4</sup> Dr Lingard

<sup>1</sup> See Dr Lloyd’s Notes to his Confutation of the Chief Doctrines of Popery (in Gibson’s Preservative).

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Trid., sess. xxii.

<sup>3</sup> See Heideggeri Anatome, 775.

<sup>4</sup> Milner, End of Controversy. Letter xl. Berington and Kirk, 264.



also, in his *Catechetical Instructions*, asking the question, "Was this sacrifice foretold in the Old Testament?" replies almost in the words of the Council of Trent just quoted; and in a note he adds, that "Christ is that pure and holy victim who was offered once in a bloody manner on Mount Calvary, and is offered daily in an unbloody manner on the altar, *in every place from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same.*"<sup>1</sup>

But Mr Keenan presents this argument in a more perfect form.

"What does the prophet Malachias say touching this sacrifice?"

"From the rising of the sun, even to the *going down* thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in EVERY PLACE there is SACRIFICE, and there is *offered* to my name a *clean oblation*."

"Does not Malachias foretell here merely the sacrifice of the cross?"

"No, not that alone; for he speaks of a sacrifice to be offered in *every place*, and the sacrifice of the cross was offered in only *one place*, and for *one time*. Hence, there must be a sacrifice of the New Law intimately connected or identical with that of the cross, to be offered up in *every place*, which can be no other than the eucharistic sacrifice.

"May not this *clean oblation* be prayer, and praise and thanksgiving?"

"No; for this would be nothing new for a prophet to foretell; this sort of oblation was offered to God in every age, even at the time the prophecy was made. Besides, who would dare to say that his *imperfect* prayer was a *clean oblation*? The prophet evidently alludes to some extraordinary sacrifice, some new *clean oblation* to come, not *already* existing, which would be substituted for all the sacrifices of the Old Law, which in the previous verses he condemns."<sup>2</sup>

Here it must at least be admitted that the Popish controversialist takes up the questions properly connected with his subject, and that the difficulties which he professes to remove, are the real difficulties connected with his interpretation of the verse. But in his method of removing these difficulties, there are many things well calculated to excite surprise.

In the first place, the translation of the verse must be noticed. It is that of the Douay Bible. It differs materially from our version in the use of the word *sacrifice*, where ours has

<sup>1</sup> Lingard, Catech. Instr., p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxvi., sec. 1.

*incense*. The word in the original is מקטר which has no such signification as *sacrifice*; and in this case, therefore, gross violence has been done by the translators to the sense of Scripture, in order apparently to countenance the doctrine of their Church. Refusing to acknowledge that the end justifies the means, we may perhaps be allowed, however, to argue in this as in a multitude of similar cases, from the nature of the means to the nature of the end.

Now let us observe how the Popish controversialist argues. "The sacrifice of the cross was offered in only *one place* and for *one time*." [The italics are his own.] Grant this assumption, and his argument may be owned as valid. But what an assumption is this? Little value is here ascribed to the sacrifice of the cross. *It was only for one time!*—How does Mr Keenan reconcile this even with his own statements elsewhere made concerning the sacrifice of the cross.<sup>1</sup> But his consistency is of little importance to us, otherwise than as it is interesting to find in his Church a heap of contradictions and errors incapable of being reduced even to harmony and agreement with one another. It is of more consequence to compare his words with the words of Scripture, "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God: From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool."<sup>2</sup>

Let us further observe the attempt made to set aside the notion that this *clean oblation* may be prayer, and praise and thanksgiving. The controversialist allows the very meaning of the text to escape him, and it would be convenient for him if it also escaped his readers. The *clean oblation*, or *pure offering*,—to adopt the more intelligible English of our own translators,

<sup>1</sup> Peter Dens himself is not so gross in his assertion regarding the sacrifice of the Cross. For arguing like Mr Keenan as to the meaning of Mal. i. 11, he only says, "Sacrificium crucis non fuerit oblatum in omni loco, sed in uno loco Judææ."—(Theol. V., 359.)

<sup>2</sup> Heb. x., 11–13.



who certainly meant to be intelligible, and were pretty successful,—is to be offered, as the prophet foretells, *in every place*. The prediction relates to the breaking down of the middle wall of partition betwixt Jews and Gentiles, and the extension of the Church under a dispensation whose worship should no longer have any particular connection with any one particular spot of earth. It is to be explained like those words of Jesus to the woman of Samaria, “Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . The hour cometh, and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.”<sup>1</sup>

But “who would dare to say that his *imperfect* prayer was a *clean oblation*?”—What! not those saints to whom the whole Church of Rome is so much indebted for their works of supererogation? Shall it not be said of those whose love is perfect? But it suits Mr Keenan at present to strain the meaning of the Scripture expression. The *pure offering* in Malachi’s prophecy is evidently nothing else than that worship of which our Lord spoke so strongly, “The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him.”<sup>2</sup>

And, finally, we are told that in the previous verses the prophet *condemns all the sacrifices of the Old Law*.—He does nothing of the kind. He condemns those whose very services are profane, and who offer the blind or the lame and the sick for sacrifice,—he points out the necessity of a right heart even to the acceptability of the sacrifices under the Old Law, as Isaiah and the other prophets had often done, and he directs his readers forward to the new dispensation and its more entirely spiritual worship.

After what has been said on this text and the Popish argument from it, it will not be necessary to go over in the same way the similar argument from Jer. xxxiii., 18. Indeed, this

<sup>1</sup> John iv., 21, 23.<sup>2</sup> John iv., 23.

argument from Mal. i., 11 is such that labour seems almost wasted in refuting it, and perhaps that is the best method of dealing with it which Dr Cunningham adopts in his notes to Stillingfleet, where he pronounces it too ridiculous to deserve an answer. Nor would any time have been spent upon it, if the purpose of the present work had not been to *exhibit* even more than to *refute*.

Almost every Popish writer who treats of this subject makes use of an argument from what the Scripture says of Melchizedek. Our Lord being declared in Scripture to be a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek, they maintain that the mass must be a sacrifice, as but for his continual offering of himself in the mass, he would not, they say, be a priest for ever, in terms of the Scripture declaration. And they insist that when Melchizedek met Abraham, and brought forth bread and wine, he offered an unbloody sacrifice.<sup>1</sup>

A specimen or two of the way of presenting this argument will suffice. The following is from Mr Keenan:—

“Why is he [Christ] styled for ever a priest, according to the order of Melchisedech?”

“Because, like Melchisedech, he used bread and wine in the sacrifice.

“Why is Christ styled a priest *for ever*, after Melchisedech’s order?”

“Because he continues, and will continue to offer the same sacrifice by the hands of his priests to the end of the world.

“Would Christ be a PRIEST FOR EVER, according to the order of Melchisedech, if a sacrifice, according to Melchisedech’s order, had been only offered up at the Last Supper by himself?”

“No; for in that case he would not be a priest for ever, but only for once, according to the order of Melchisedech: to be a *priest for ever*, it was necessary he should establish an everlasting order of priests, to offer the same sacrifice, as his substitutes.

“Would Christ be a priest, according to the order of Melchisedech, if he had not used bread and wine in a true and real sacrifice in the Last Supper?”

“No; for if he did not do so in the Last Supper, he is not a priest at all, according to the order of Melchisedech; since there is no resemblance between his sacrifice on the cross and the sacrifice of Melchisedech; and

<sup>1</sup> See Berington and Kirk, 264. Dens, Theol., V., 360., &c.



if Christ did not at his Last Supper, he never at any other time did, offer a sacrifice similar in any manner to that of Melchisedech."<sup>1</sup>

The Protestant reader learns with surprise that the great or rather the sole point of resemblance betwixt Melchizedek and Christ was in the using of bread and wine for the purpose of sacrifice. Believing that neither the one nor the other ever did so, he has been accustomed to look to other points of supposed resemblance, and he still desires to be informed whether they are not points of real resemblance, and suitable to the scope of those passages of Scripture which speak of Melchizedek as a type of Christ. For he finds in these a sufficient reason for the importance ascribed to Melchizedek as a type, without having recourse to this.

The following quotation from Dr Milner presents the same absurdity, if possible, in still grosser form :—

"Now, in what did this *order of Melchisedech* consist? In what, I ask, did his sacrifice differ from those which Abraham himself and the other patriarchs, as well as Aaron and his sons, offered? Let us consult the sacred text as to what it says concerning this royal priest, when he came to meet Abraham on his return from victory :—'*Melchisedech, the king of Salem, bringing forth BREAD AND WINE, for he was the priest of the Most High God, blessed him.*' Gen. xiv. 18. It was then in offering up a sacrifice of bread of wine, instead of slaughtered animals, that Melchisedech's sacrifice differed from the generality of those in the Old Law, and that he prefigured the sacrifice which Christ was to institute in the New Law from the same elements. No other sense but this can be elicited from the Scripture as to this matter; and, accordingly, the holy fathers unanimously adhere to this meaning."<sup>2</sup>

Enough now of quotation on this subject. But let it be observed how the text of Scripture is vitiated to serve a purpose of controversy. Melchizedek is made by the Douay translation to bring forth bread and wine as a duty of his priesthood, "bringing forth bread and wine, FOR he was the priest of the Most High God."—And let it be observed how contrary the notion, which makes the resemblance betwixt Melchizedek and

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxvi., sect. 1. (From Scheffmacher.)

<sup>2</sup> Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xl.

Christ to consist in the use of bread and wine, is to the whole tenor of those passages of Scripture which treat of this typical resemblance. The Apostle Paul himself draws the parallel, and without mention of bread and wine. "For this Melchizedec, king of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him, to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; *first being by interpretation king of righteousness, and after that, also king of Salem, which is king of peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually.*"<sup>1</sup>

It is impossible to avoid wonder at the men who either in blindness or in impudence, pass over all this, and proclaim the use of bread and wine to be the great point of similarity.

But as it remains to be proved that our Lord Jesus used the bread and wine for the purpose of sacrifice, so it remains to be proved that Melchizedek used the bread and wine which he brought forth, for any other purpose than to give refreshment to Abraham and his followers.—On this subject we may listen for a moment to Peter Dens. He states the objection, but says,

"Although it is probable that Melchisedech divided the bread and wine to the companions of Abraham, because it was customary with the ancients to partake of the oblation in sacrifices of thanksgiving; however, it is not to be doubted that the same things were first offered as a sacrifice to the Lord, because Melchisedech certainly knew that Abraham's soldiers being laden with spoil were not in want of bread and wine to be brought to them from any other quarter, therefore he did not bring forth bread and wine for the refreshment of the army, but that by a solemn sacrifice he might render thanks to God for the victory of Abraham."<sup>2</sup>

Brief and conclusive! "It is not to be doubted." Yet perhaps the spoil was not quite in that state in which it could be used for immediate refreshment. And even were this granted, yet the offering of sacrifice is not the only purpose which can be imagined.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. vii., 1-3.

<sup>2</sup> Dens, Theol., V., 360.



But here arises a very nice question. Were the bread and wine *transubstantiated*, which Melchizedek, as is alleged, offered in sacrifice to God? And into what were they transubstantiated? Are we to understand that the real body and blood of Christ were offered in sacrifice ages *before* he came in the flesh at all? Yet, if not, what are we to think of *this* unbloody sacrifice?

And what are we to think of any *unbloody sacrifice*, claiming to be regarded as a sacrifice of propitiation? What, but that it is an imposture and a delusion? The very terms are contradictory. "Without shedding of blood there is no remission."<sup>1</sup>

And as to our Lord's being a priest for ever, we find these words amply verified in his perpetual intercession, founded as that is on a perfect and accepted sacrifice. Let the reader revert to what has been quoted on this subject from Mr Keenan, and compare it with the words of the Apostle Paul. "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself."<sup>2</sup>

Again, if the perpetual offering of sacrifice be necessary to the priesthood of Christ, as Mr Keenan asserts, it would seem to follow that the Jewish priests of old were priests only during the time that they were actually employed in offering sacrifice. I am not aware of any Popish author who mentions this, but it is certainly a legitimate inference. In like manner it must follow that Christ himself is not a priest except at those moments during which mass is being somewhere performed upon earth.

Holding, as they do, that the mass is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead,—that it is the same sacrifice which Christ offered upon the cross,—that Christ himself offers the sacrifice and merely employs the priest as his agent or instrument in so doing,—the priests of Rome are surely chargeable with prodigious inconsistency when they sell masses for money, and refuse to say them except for

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. vii. 27. And see the whole of that chapter.

payment, and also when they profess to say them in order to the application of the benefit of them to the most insignificant and trifling purposes, or in commemoration of saints. Theirs is a monstrous doctrine, and a monstrous trade. Jesus Christ *made* and offered up in sacrifice to God for money!—for three shillings and sixpence, or five shillings! It is a horrible representation which is set before us. Jesus Christ performing the functions of his priesthood for money, offering himself at a stipulated price as a propitiation for the sins of the quick and the dead! And all this in order that one Irishman may recover some stolen goods, or that another Irishman's diseased pig may be restored to health, or in celebration of the virtues and excellencies of some such miserable mortal as St Rose of Lima, or St Veronica Giuliani, or perhaps of St Ignatius or St Domenic!

As an illustration of the impiety of this pretended offering of Christ in honour of the saints, I shall only present the reader with the following brief extract from the *Ordinary of the Mass* as it appears in the *Key of Heaven*:—

"*Bowing in the midst of the altar, he [the priest] says,—*

"Receive, O holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to thee, in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honour of the blessed Mary ever Virgin, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints; that it may be available to their honour and our salvation: and may they vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate on earth; through the same Christ our Lord. Amen."<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the payment taken by the priests for saying masses,—instead of repeating any of those statements of the fact and its particulars, with which most readers are probably pretty familiar, I think it better to exhibit some of the reasons and rules as given by these eminent leaders of the Popish mind, Peter Dens and St Alphonsus Liguori. Of course the custom finds countenance in antiquity, and there is the usual unhesitat-

<sup>1</sup> Key of Heaven, 126.



ing reference to the primitive Church. That it is quite right to receive payment is plainly asserted, but one of those distinctions is introduced, from which the moral character of the Church of Rome may be too easily judged,—a distinction such as men only employ, in order to impose upon their own consciences, when they well know that they are doing wrong. The payment is not to be taken as a price of the mass itself, for that would be simoniacal, but under the name of support [*titulo sustentationis*] upon occasion of celebrating mass, and the propriety of all this is established by reference to texts which merely prove the right of the ministry to support,—by an argument in favour merely of that right,—and by this admirable confirmatory argument, that the Church adopts this rule of payments all over the world, and therefore it must be allowable, if we would not inculcate the Church, which it is very rash to do.<sup>1</sup>

But the distinction just mentioned is even more advantageous than at first sight appears, for it not only keeps the conscience in good condition with regard to the acceptance of the payment, but it saves the priest from the guilt of simony, even although he be of such a disposition that he would say no mass if he did not receive his pay. For,—as a very sagacious theologian and of no small distinction, Daelman, has found out,—he does not perform his function for a worldly consideration, but the worldly consideration is only the cause which at the present time and place determines him to the performance of that function which he performs with a pure regard to the honour of God!<sup>2</sup> The rate of payment is fixed by the Ordinary of each diocese, and priests are strictly prohibited from exacting more; but they may take it, if it is freely given. Very strict rules are also found necessary to prevent priests of unusual popularity from getting large sums for too many masses, and hiring others at the usual rates to say them in their stead, and to guard against many similar abuses. And the casuists of Rome have found occasion

<sup>1</sup> “Ergo est licitus, nisi culpam vellemus ecclesiam, quod temerarium est.” Dens, Theol., V., 390. <sup>2</sup> Dens, Theol., V., 391.

for all their subtility in questions of morality and conscience, arising out of this matter of payment for masses, and in deciding as to the venial or mortal character of some of the offences into which it is supposed possible that priests may fall.<sup>1</sup>

Amongst the consequences of the doctrine of transubstantiation is the denial of the cup to the laity,—an abuse which, as a manifest deprivation of external privilege, has sometimes excited the indignation of those who knew little of spiritual privileges or of pure doctrine, and were far from being prepared for the higher steps of reformation. It serves the purpose of making a palpable distinction betwixt the clergy and the laity, a thing essential to the scheme of priestcraft and of priestly power. Papists are accustomed to allege that as Christ is present under each *species*, that is, under the form of bread and under the form of wine, and in every particle of each, there is no need for the laity to receive more than the bread or wafer, which, being consecrated, they call the host, as receiving this they certainly receive a whole Christ;—assuming to themselves, of course, the right of modifying Christ's ordinances at their pleasure. It does not quite appear why, on this view of the matter, the priest should drink the wine, of which travellers tell us that in other countries, whatever may be the fashion in this country, the priest saying mass is accustomed to quaff a good bumper. The argument above quoted appears quite as applicable to clergy as to laity, and really, therefore, has nothing to do with the actual question. But it is further argued, that were the cup handed about there would be great danger of profanation and indecency by the spilling of the precious contents, not now wine but the blood of Christ. The argument is founded upon the doctrine of transubstantiation, and illustrates it. Of such illustrations we shall presently see more when we come to the mode of celebrating the mass, and the mode of receiving the Eucharist.

<sup>1</sup> Dens, Theol.—Liguori (Theol. Mor., IV., 116, &c.) perfectly agrees with Dens on this whole subject, but enters into it at much greater length, and with great minuteness of casuistry.



All this is so plainly opposed to the original mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper, that Popish controversialists show a peculiar anxiety to get some sort of countenance from Scripture for their present practice. And this they profess to find in those passages which mention the sacrament of the Lord's Supper merely as the breaking of bread. They quote some passages of which the reference to the Lord's Supper is very doubtful. But at all events, just as the phrase *breaking of bread* is used to designate the whole eating of a meal or partaking of a refreshment, so it is employed to indicate the whole action of the sacrament of the Supper.

Papists allege many things in the mode of dispensing the sacrament not really so important as this, by which they say it is vitiated or destroyed: yet in this they have taken the liberty to make so great a change without any decent shew of warrant from Scripture. "If the bread be not of wheat, or if there be so great a mixture of other grain that it cannot be called wheat bread, or if any way corrupted, it does not make a sacrament." "If any requisite be wanting, it is no sacrament; for example, if it be celebrated out of holy ground, or upon an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three napkins; if there be no wax candles; if it be not celebrated between day-break and noon; if the celebrator have not said matins with lauds; or if he omit any of the sacerdotal robes; if these robes and the napkins be not blessed by a bishop; if there be no clerk present to serve, or one who ought not to serve, a woman for example; if there be no chalice, the cup of which is gold, or silver, or pewter; if the vestment be not of clean linen, adorned with silk in the middle, and blessed by a bishop; if the priest celebrate with his head covered; if there be no missal present, though he have it by heart."<sup>1</sup>

Here we may pause to look at a little specimen in passing; of the theology of that great luminary of the Popish Church, St Alphonsus Liguori, admired of Cardinal Wiseman. And as it

<sup>1</sup> Romish Missal, quoted by M'Gavin, Protestant.

is impossible to enter into all these points, we may select that of the number of napkins. There is required, he says, in order to the sacrifice of the mass, *in the second place*,

"*Mappa linea triplex, &c.*—Three linen napkins; for although according to some, one doubled will suffice, nay, according to Sa, (*Angel. Azor.*, c. 28, qu. 8, and *Laym.*, lib. 5, t. 5, c. 6, num. 17,) a single one in case of necessity,—yet the Roman Missal, published by authority of Clement VIII. and Pius V., expressly requires three, (*tit. de defect.*, as also *Gavant.* See *Card. de Lugo.*)" &c., &c.

"But it is doubted, 1. Whether two napkins will suffice, or one doubled? It is affirmed by *Suarez*, dist. 21, sect. 6; *Laym.*, cap. 6, num. 11; *Holzm.*, n. 371; *Pal.*, p. 10, n. 1; also by *Sa*, *Azor.*, likewise *Bon. Henr.*, and *Gob. ap. Croix*, num. 322, even although the two napkins do not cover the whole altar; it being good reason, according to them, that such is the custom. However, I think the rubric ought not to be departed from, . . ."

and here follows another display of learning and citation of authorities not less appalling than that which has just preceded on the other side.

Enough now of these requisites. These are pitiful things indeed to destroy the sacrament, and insignificant in comparison with this in which Rome has introduced so great a change. Were there three napkins on the table when our Lord instituted the sacrament? But such absurdities are not to be argued down; they are rather to be exhibited in order to contempt. And it is curious to contrast them with what Popish writers affect to treat as of comparative indifference.

However, Mr Keenan discovers other things to be classed along with this, and will have it, that we Protestants who magnify this into a thing of such consequence ought to assign a similar importance to these likewise.

"What should they do, if all that Christ did be essentially necessary?

"They should wash the feet of all that are admitted to the sacrament; they should break the bread; they should make the chalice, or cup, pass from hand to hand; they should receive the sacrament after supper, and only twelve should sit at the same table."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lig., Theol. Mor., IV., 179. <sup>2</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxv., sect. 2.



The first part of this answer confounds with the sacrament a thing which was quite distinct from it; then follow things which very many Protestants have been accustomed to observe as belonging to the most simple and decent celebration of the sacrament, though not deeming them essential; and the conclusion sinks into a childishness perhaps seldom paralleled in polemical writings.

The following is from the same source, and exhibits not a little of the same character.

"Why do you say that Christ promises the same reward to the reception of one as to the reception of both kinds?"

Because this is clearly laid down in John vi., 50; 'This is the *bread* which cometh down from heaven, that if any man eat of it, *he may not die.*' 52: 'If any man EAT of this BREAD, *he shall live for ever.*' 58: 'As I live by the Father, so he that *eateth* me, the same shall live by me.' 59: 'Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth this *bread* shall live for ever.'

"What do you observe on these passages?"

"That Christ promised eternal life to those who receive under one kind, as well as to those who receive under both." &c.<sup>1</sup>

Were ever words of Scripture so bereft of their glorious meaning? But, it may also be asked, does not Mr Keenan here really teach that every man who receives that *bread*, (so called, as he tells us, according to the appearance,) is necessarily saved? He modifies this doctrine elsewhere; but is not this the doctrine here?

Nor is this an inference easy to be avoided from the doctrines of transubstantiation and the mass. What entire dependence for his salvation the Papist places upon the alleged mass-sacrifice and his imagined eating and drinking of the real body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, appears from the style in which Wiseman and others always speak of the greatness and awfulness of this subject, or from such passages as the following, which it would not be easy to explain in any way that would exclude from salvation any one who actually partook of the Popish sacrament.

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, *ut supra*.

"And beside it," [beside the "infallible and enduring authority" in the Church to teach, "appointed and guaranteed by Christ himself,"] "he has placed the tree of life, in the life-giving institution of which we last have treated, a perpetual memorial of the benefits of redemption, bearing that sweetest food of salvation, which weighed down with its blessing the tree of Golgotha, lasting and immortal as the plant of knowledge beside which it stands. Here we partake of a victim which truly unites and incorporates us with God, and gives us a pledge of his friendship and love, and supplies a never failing source of benediction and grace."<sup>1</sup>

Well may we pity them,—their tree of knowledge the teaching of the Church, and their tree of life a wafer!

But Papists are taught to pray, whilst they hear mass, that the Holy Trinity may receive their offering which they offer by the hands of the priest for their own sins of thought, word, and deed, of omission and of commission, for grace not to commit sin in time to come, for the salvation of their souls and bodies, their redemption from every evil, and their temporal and eternal welfare. More entire dependence could not be expressed upon the sacrifice of the cross itself, and yet the prayers in which it is expressed make no mention whatever of the cross, nor of any other sacrifice than that which is offered by the hands of the priest.<sup>2</sup>

It is to this doctrine of transubstantiation and of the sacrifice of the mass that Cardinal Wiseman ascribes, and justly, the high consideration of the priests in the Church of Rome.

"The sacred character which the Catholic priest possesses in the estimation of his flock, the power of blessing with which he seems invested, are both the results of that familiarity with which, in the holy mysteries, he is allowed to approach his Lord."<sup>3</sup>

His are indeed the hands which create God! "It is a most execrable thing," said Pope Pascal II., "that those hands which have received a power above that of angels—which can, by an act of their ministry create God himself, and offer him for the

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, II., 237.

<sup>2</sup> See *Preci Quotidiane*, &c., pp. 15, 16, in *Uffizio della B. V. Maria*, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, II., 238, 239.



salvation of the world—should ever be put in subjection to the hands of kings.”<sup>1</sup> “He that created me,” says Cardinal Biel, “gave me, if it be lawful to tell, power to create himself.”<sup>2</sup> These instances are fearfully significant of the impious arrogance which characterises the priests of Rome. They have, however, become so cautious as to avoid the use of this expression, and we would look in vain in the catechisms of Mr Keenan or the lectures of Cardinal Wiseman for the assertion that the priest creates God. Nay, Peter Dens condemns the expression as erroneous, but on grounds which still leave license for all the notion that it could ever have been intended to convey.

“For a like reason,” [he says;—he has been shewing that there is no *annihilation* of the bread and wine,] “the action by which the body of Christ is made to be present cannot be called *creation*; because to create is to produce something out of nothing, but the body of Christ is made out of the bread [*conficitur ex pane*].”<sup>3</sup>

It seems to follow as a necessary consequence from the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, that the priest has the power to make Christ, or to make as many Christs as he will,—or to make God, and as many Gods as he will. Papists, however, now very generally endeavour to explain their system so as to glose this over. The priest, they say, acts only ministerially, and the miraculous change is really the work of Christ himself, wrought by his own divine power. Dr Milner quietly assumes this as the only possible view of the subject, and Mr Keenan’s questions and answers are framed on the same principle. This is also Gother’s assumption.<sup>4</sup> And in the “Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire,” published in 1806, with the Bull of the Pope, and the Mandamus of the Archbishop of Paris, we have these questions and answers:—

<sup>1</sup> See Anderson, *The Mass*, 23.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Edgar, *Variations of Popery*, 384.

<sup>3</sup> Dens, *Theol.*, V., 287.

<sup>4</sup> See Stillingfleet’s *Reply*; *Doct. and Pract.*, &c., 113.

“Then it is not man that works this miracle?”

“No; it is Jesus Christ, whose word is employed in the sacrament.

“Then it is Jesus Christ who consecrates?”

“It is Jesus Christ who consecrates; the priest is only his minister.”<sup>1</sup>

But this is, after all, to represent the priest as standing in the same relation to this alleged miracle as Elijah and Elisha did to the miracles wrought by them, or Peter and John to the curing of the lame man at the Beautiful gate of the temple. Nor were these prophets and apostles representatives of the *person* of Christ as the Popish priest is alleged to be, nor the miracles wrought by them half so great and important as this alleged miracle. So that according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, every priest of that Church must be invested with a sacred awfulness, in the estimation of its members, exceeding that which the miracles wrought by prophets and apostles created in the spectators. And the language employed in some Popish books is much less guarded than the specimens which have just been quoted. In Dr James Butler’s *Catechism*, for instance, we have Popery thus adapted to the intellectual and moral condition of the uneducated multitudes of Ireland.

“Did Christ give power to the priests of his Church to change bread and wine into his body and blood?”

“Yes; when he said to his apostles, at his last supper, ‘Do this in commemoration of me.’

“Why did Christ give to the priests of his Church so great a power?”

“That his children, throughout all ages and nations, might have a most acceptable sacrifice to offer to their Heavenly Father, and the most precious food to nourish their souls.

“By whom are the bread and wine changed into the body and blood of Christ?”

“By the priest, but in virtue of the words of Christ, whose person the priest represents, at the awful moment of consecration.”<sup>2</sup>

Along with this should be noticed the doctrine of *Intention*.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Elliot’s *Delineation of Roman Catholicism*, 137.

<sup>2</sup> The Most Rev. Dr James Butler’s *Cat.*, Lesson xxvi.



The plenitude of the priest's power is to be learned from this doctrine, and the entire and abject dependence of the people upon him for their salvation. He can apply masses to any particular object he pleases according to his intention, and this intention is necessary to give his outward action value. It is needless to insist upon the consequences, so often exposed, of utter uncertainty concerning the validity of sacraments upon which a man's salvation is represented as depending, and of course as to salvation itself, or rather whether yet the man deluded by mere apparent administration of the sacrament may not be in the very condition from which he expected it to deliver him. We find indeed very little on this doctrine of intention in the writings of our modern British advocates of Popery. It could not easily be represented in an attractive aspect, and they have thought it most convenient either not to represent it at all or to say so little about it as to lead the reader if possible to pass it over without much notice. But

"What should be the disposition of those who administer sacraments?" says Mr Keenan.

"They should be in a state of grace, and have the intention of doing what the Church does in each.—Conc. Trid., sess. 7, can. 11. Hence a person merely imitating what the Church does, without the intention of doing it, would not confer a sacrament."<sup>1</sup>

It would be easy to shew that the doctrine of intention is here stated in its most mitigated form. St Alphonsus Liguori, quoting from some great man who has gone before him, asserts something more than this, when in reply to the question, "To whom does it belong to apply the fruit of the sacrifice" [of the mass]? he says, "The priest alone who offers it really does this by his intention, because it is an act of the sacerdotal power."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 12.

<sup>2</sup> Lig., Theol. Mor., IV., 139.

However, I shall not attempt to investigate this subject any farther, nor to trace all the consequences which follow from the doctrine of transubstantiation. Perhaps the most important of these is that gross idolatry into which the Church of Rome has fallen in what she calls the adoration of the host, for as the doctrine of transubstantiation leads men away from all trust in the one sacrifice made by Christ upon the cross,—so it also leads them, and even more directly, into one of the most pitiful and ridiculous forms of idolatry.

Papists do not attempt to deny, but openly justify the adoration of the host. The Council of Trent gave forth its anathema against all who should deny "that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is to be worshipped in the holy sacrament of the eucharist even with the external worship of *latria*," that which, according to the Popish distinction of different kinds of worship, is proper only to the Divine Being,—and against all who should say that HE is not thus to be carried about in processions and presented to the people for adoration, "according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of the Church," and against all who should say that the worshippers are idolaters.<sup>1</sup> Nothing exasperates Popish controversialists more than this branch of the charge of idolatry brought against their Church. Their defence is simple, and rests entirely on the doctrine of transubstantiation. "For we believe the very same God to be present in that sacrament," say the Tridentine Fathers, "whom the Eternal Father bringing into the world said, *And let all the angels of God worship him*, whom the magi went to adore," &c.<sup>2</sup>

"Why do you say that Catholics worship Christ in his person more than Protestants?"

inquires Mr Keenan, and replies,—

"Because the worship which Catholics render to the person of Christ, present in the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar, shows it sufficiently.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Trid., sess. xiii., can. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Trid., sess. xiii., can. 5.



In conformity with their creed they render to Christ really present all the adoration in their power.”<sup>1</sup>

Such is the language which Papists employ to defend their worship of a wafer, a thing of flour and water, a little *breaden* god, which hangs up in a box within their sanctuary, or is carried about the streets, “because it cannot go,”<sup>2</sup> and is liable to corruption and to indecent accidents from careless hands of men, or teeth of mice or other animals. The subject is one which presents many aspects apt for ridicule, and we have the example of Elijah and of other prophets for the use of ridicule in such a case, that idolatry may be exposed to the contempt which it deserves as much as abhorrence. The method however which Papists adopt to represent in a more favourable light this part of their religion is to affirm that they “adore their Lord veiled under these sacred signs” of apparent bread and wine.<sup>3</sup> They forget that this is in effect the same light in which the ancient heathenism of Greece and Rome was represented by some of its apologists, and that many of the Hindoos give a similar account of their religion at the present day, professing to worship the divinity present in the idol and not the mere wood or stone itself. But the question comes to be, Is the divinity present there? Is the Lord Jesus Christ veiled under these forms of bread and wine as the Papists pretend? And if not, it is impossible that they should escape the condemnation of idolaters; their false notion will not alter the reality of the case.

This is a subject on which Dr Milner exerts all his strength, and exhibits all his subtlety in argument. He not only labours to shew that the charge of idolatry is unfounded, because the doctrine of transubstantiation is true, which is the line of argument commonly adopted by all Papists, but he maintains, in op-

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xiii., sect. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Jer. x., 5.

<sup>3</sup> Challoner, Cath. Chr. Instr., ch. vi. So Perrone. “Quomodo enim ipsi adorare possent panem, cujus substantiam per consecrationis verba conversam in Christi corpus esse profitentur?” (Praellect. Theol., II., 225.)

position to many of his Church, though he takes no notice of them and their opinions,<sup>1</sup> that even if the doctrine of transubstantiation were false, the Papists, because they believe it to be true, would not be fairly chargeable with idolatry. According to him, it is a “disingenuous practice” of Protestants to misrepresent Catholics as *worshippers of bread and wine* in the sacrament, and therefore as *idolaters*,—at the same time” says he,

“that our adversaries are perfectly aware that we firmly believe, as an article of faith, that *there is no bread and wine*, but Christ alone, true God, as well as man, present in it. Supposing for a moment, that we are mistaken in this belief, the worst we could be charged with, would be an error; in supposing Christ to be where he is not; and nothing but uncharitable calumny, or gross inattention, could accuse us of the heinous crime of idolatry. To illustrate this argument, let me suppose, that being charged with a loyal address to the Sovereign, you presented it by mistake to one of his courtiers, or even to an inanimate figure of him, which for some reason or other, had been dressed up in royal robes, and placed on the throne; would your heart reproach you, or would any sensible person charge you with the guilt of treason in this conduct?”<sup>2</sup>

It would almost seem as if some mischievous acquaintance had suggested this illustration to the grave Doctor with the view of making his Church ridiculous. Imagine a person charged with a loyal address to the Sovereign, and insisting upon presenting it to some other person instead, some menial of the palace or beggar of the streets, or rather insisting upon presenting it to some inanimate object, as a drunken man has been known to take off his hat to a pump, or to persevere in mistaking a stone wall for his own riding pony. Dr Milner, indeed, glosses it over under the notion of the address being presented by mistake to one of the courtiers;—but this will not do, for there might be resemblance in that case, but here resemblance is out of the question. And the Doctor seems to feel this, for he varies the illustration in so far as to suppose an image dressed up in royal robes, and placed upon the throne. But he does not much mend the matter. For this is not a very likely supposition,—nor is it

<sup>1</sup> See references in Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract. ch. v.

<sup>2</sup> Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxvi.



very likely that any man in his senses would mistake and continue to mistake such an inanimate figure for his sovereign. But here again the illustration is intentionally framed so as to glose over the worst features of the case. For there ought to be nothing in it of a *figure* of the sovereign dressed up in royal robes. But suppose that the person charged with the loyal address were by any chance to see a loaf of bread upon the throne,—or a bread basket,—and were to proceed to his demonstrations of loyalty. And what if it had been placed there by himself? Would his own act be his excuse? Or suppose, which would be still liker the case, that the bread basket were not upon the throne at all, but in some other place, such as it is proper for a bread basket to occupy. It is probable there would be no talk of treason. Every one would account for it on the ground of madness. But unhappily, in the actual case, that theory is inadmissible.

And again, to take Dr Milner's illustration, which he varies afterwards in a singular way, saying, "Were the people who thought in their hearts that John the Baptist was the Christ, Luke iii. 15, and who probably worshipped him as such, idolaters in consequence of their error?"<sup>1</sup>—where, it may be observed, he makes a most gratuitous supposition in order that his illustration, if possible, may be something better than an illustration,—I say, to take this illustration, let us consider if the benefits attending a real act of loyalty would equally accrue from a mistaken performance of it like this. Or, let us consider if the sovereign would be well pleased with those as loyal subjects who not only presented some particular address, but rendered all submission and homage to some mock king mistaken for himself, and perseveringly maintained in one of his palaces, with some portion of his own royal revenues thus egregiously misapplied. This is to give the illustration something more of the shape and aspect which really befits the case. Would this be loyalty?

Dr Doyle manages the defence of his Church upon this point

<sup>1</sup> Milner, *ut supra*.

much in the same way with Dr Milner. As he also is eminent amongst the recent advocates of the Popish cause in this country,—although there is some reason to think that he died a believer in the Protestant doctrines which he so long and vehemently opposed,<sup>1</sup>—it may be proper to give the reader an opportunity of comparing his argument with those which have been already exhibited.

"To declare the sacrifice of the mass to be idolatry is really absurd, because idolatry is the worship of a creature as God, and at mass no Catholic ever worshipped anything but God; the thought of worshipping the appearance of bread in the consecrated host never enters their mind; their homage is exclusively directed to Christ.

"If he be not present, we may be guilty of a mistake or of an error, but unquestionably we are not guilty of adoring what we see or touch, which alone would be idolatry. We believe that Christ, though present, is veiled from our eyes, and it is Him alone we adore, to Him only do we pay our homage, and not to any creature in heaven or upon the earth."<sup>2</sup>

In the first of these paragraphs we have nothing but assertion, and in the second little more; and a strange assertion it seems, though so common amongst Papists, that a mistake as to the nature of the object of worship is harmless, though men worship that as God which is no God, but a little morsel of bread, and that they are not to be regarded as worshipping *it*, but according to what their worship would be if *it* were out of the question altogether. Mistakes are seldom so harmless in things of less consequence. A man who mistakes the road to Edinburgh for the road to London will reach Edinburgh and not London, however urgent might be his reasons for wishing to reach the latter place. A man who puts a light to a barrel of gunpowder will be blown away by the explosion, however sincerely he may believe the contents of the barrel to be American flour.

But Dr Doyle has still another argument.

"Supposing a layman, an impostor, to personify a priest, and attempt to

<sup>1</sup> See the *Morning of Life*, (Memoirs of an Intended Nun). Bath: (Binns and Goodwin. A number of editions.)

<sup>2</sup> Letters on the State of Ireland, by J. K. L. (Dublin, 1825.)—270, 271.



celebrate mass, would any person consider those who attended and worshipped at the supposed sacrifice to be idolaters? No . . . they would be dupes, but not idolaters; and if their error in this case would exempt them from the horrible crime of giving supreme honour to anything less than God, would not a similar error, supposing it to exist, excuse them also should Christ not be present when a priest consecrates?"<sup>1</sup>

This argument at least illustrates in some measure the doctrine of intention. How far from Christian spirituality must that worship be, which is continually attended with the danger of the worshipper being thus duped! Nor is it only when a layman personates a priest that there is a possibility of the consecration *failing*, but, from many causes, some of which are beyond the scrutiny of the worshipper, even when a priest officiates.<sup>2</sup> As for the argument, it is entirely founded upon an assertion of the same nature with the conclusion and equally requiring to be supported by proof. The Popish bishop might as well have repeated the assertion, more directly referring to the matter in hand, which he had made in the two preceding paragraphs. But in spite both of assertion and subtle argument, it is an opinion which commends itself to common sense, that if "the fashioned god remaineth bread," "the blind people," as John Knox says, "commit idolatry." And therefore Pope Alexander V., considering that the priest's purpose and his privy doings about the consecration, cannot be known, gives his judgment, that "no man ought to worship the sacrament when it is holden up, but with this condition, *si ille consecraverit*, that is, if the priest has consecrated." But Thomas Aquinas is not quite so hard upon the worshipper, and says it is not necessary for him actually to say or think thus; whensoever he kneels

<sup>1</sup> Letters of J. K. L., 272.

<sup>2</sup> "For if there be not an anointed priest to play his part aright, all the former artificers have lost their labour; for without him that god cannot be made: yea, if he have not *intention*, the fashioned god remaineth bread, and so the blind people commit idolatry."—Knox, Reasoning with the Abbot of Crossraguel.

down to worship, it will be sufficient if there be in his mind a readiness to do so. (*Satis est habere habitum.*)<sup>1</sup>

There is a curious difference observable in the Popish books of devotion most in use in this country, in the acts of worship connected with the sacrament. Some of them, although gross enough in other respects, as to the transubstantiation, the propitiation by that host, &c., yet exhibit a considerable degree of caution and reserve in the expressions of adoration, whilst others with more glaring offensiveness adore that very object which is present to the eyes and which is touched and swallowed. To exhibit this difference, however, in a manner at all satisfactory, would require almost as many pages as I can, at present devote lines to the subject, and instead of attempting it, I shall merely quote from these works a few of the sentences most characteristic of Popery and illustrative of the nature of that adoration which, with more or less of grossness, Papists are taught to render to the *host*. The following are selections from the "Litany of the Blessed Sacrament" as given in the *Key of Heaven*.

"Jesus, our incomprehensible God, who though the heaven of heavens cannot contain thy immensity, yet vouchsafest personally to reside in our churches, and dwell amongst us in a small tabernacle, Have mercy upon us.

"Jesus, our sovereign King, who, though thy throne above is continually surrounded by glorified ministering spirits, yet vouchsafest here in our most solemn processions to be accompanied by such mean attendants as ourselves, Have mercy upon us.

"Jesus, our gracious God, who, condescending to the weakness of our nature, coverest thy glory under the familiar forms of bread and wine, and permittest thyself to be seen, touched, and tasted by wretched sinners, Have mercy upon us."<sup>2</sup>

The idolatry here is somewhat veiled, and even in the following verse,

<sup>1</sup> See Jewel, Sermon preached at Paul's Cross, Works, (Parker Soc.,) I., 13.

<sup>2</sup> Key of Heaven, 203.



"Jesus, the Lamb without spot, who art every day sacrificed, and yet always livest, every day eaten, and yet still remainest entire,"

although monstrous in its way, the idolatrous character is by no means so flagrant as in that "Litany of the Holy Sacrament" which M<sup>r</sup>Gavin quotes from the *Manual of Godly Prayers*,<sup>1</sup> where there are to be found such acts of devotion as

"Most pure table, Have mercy upon us,"

"Memorial of God's wonderful works, Have mercy upon us,"

"Holy host, Have mercy upon us,"

"Chalice of benediction, Have mercy upon us,"

"Most high and venerable sacrament, Have mercy upon us,"

"Dreadful and life giving sacrament, Have mercy upon us,"

"Bread, by the words of Omnipotence made flesh, Have mercy upon us;"

where the idolatry is so undisguised, that one would think even impudence itself could hardly venture to assert that it is not idolatry.

Yet even this is scarcely, if at all, more gross than the following verse of a hymn which "is sometimes sung at the benediction,"<sup>2</sup> and sometimes "at solemn masses, during the elevation :—"<sup>3</sup>

"O salutaris hostia

Qui coeli pandis ostium ;

Bella premunt hostilia,

Da robur, fer auxilium ;"

which is thus given in English in Husenbeth's Missal for the Laity,—<sup>4</sup>

"O saving victim, opening wide

The portals of our resting-place ;

When wars oppress, when ills betide,

O give us strength, and grant us grace."

In Gahan's Complete Manual of Catholic Piety, the worshipper is thus instructed concerning his duty at the elevation of the host :—

<sup>1</sup> See Protestant, No. lx.

<sup>2</sup> Key of Heaven, 141.

<sup>3</sup> Gahan's Catholic Piety, 348.

<sup>4</sup> P. 36.

"Behold your God, your Saviour, and your Judge! Contemplate in silent astonishment what passes before you," &c.

and thus to begin his prayer,

"Hail, O Victim of Salvation! Eternal King! Incarnate Word! sacrificed for me and all mankind!" &c. &c.

after which, and a similar prayer at the elevation of the chalice, he receives this instruction,—

"During the remainder of the canon, contemplate in the most affectionate manner your Saviour here present. Reflect on the mysteries he renews. Unite the sacrifice of your heart to that of his body," &c.<sup>1</sup>

After all that have been already quoted, it may yet perhaps be proper to add a passage or two which occur in the Child's Manual of Prayer, a very little book, but introduced to the world with the formal approbation of Dr Wiseman. Here we have in the devotion to be used "from the Preface to the Elevation."—

"Each moment now brings me nearer to that one in which thou wilt descend upon this altar, Saviour of my soul!"

Then, "at the Elevation of the Host,"—

"O God, thou comest! thou comest! I love, I adore, I believe in thy most sacred presence."<sup>2</sup>

With which may be compared the following from the *Key of Heaven*, at the elevation of the host, and at the elevation of the chalice,—

"Most adorable Body, I adore thee with all the powers of my soul. Lord, who hast given thyself entire to us, grant we may become entirely thine."

"Most adorable blood, that washest away all our sins, I adore thee: happy we, could we return our life and blood for thine, O blessed Victim."<sup>3</sup>

Not only is this idolatry, as it is referred to the bread and

<sup>1</sup> Gahan's Catholic Piety, 66-68.

<sup>2</sup> The Child's Manual of Prayer, 46-48.

<sup>3</sup> Key of Heaven, 106.



wine, whatever they are supposed to have become, but there need be no hesitation in saying it would be idolatry, although referred to the very body and blood of Christ, as they once were upon Calvary, or as now they are in heaven: for it is not the mere humanity of Christ, much less a mere portion of his humanity, that is separately to be adored; and this separation is a vain multiplication of objects of worship, and worse than vain, turning the professed worship of the Lord of Glory into rank idolatry. We shall have occasion to return to this consideration, in connection with other parts of Popish idolatry.

But the doctrine of transubstantiation is fruitful of results so calculated to make all religion appear ridiculous, that it might seem as if devils had made sport of men when such things were introduced into worship. Many of the forms and ceremonies, rules and observances connected with the celebration of mass are almost inconceivably puerile and degrading, although they spring legitimately enough from that doctrine which leads to the worship of the wafer. The natural properties of bread and wine remaining after consecration, as Papists are forced to confess, their god is liable to all mischances which might happen to unconsecrated bread and wine, and undergoes corruption. Hence a number of strange rules become requisite. Again, from what we have seen to be the doctrine concerning every individual particle or drop, every particle or drop must be infinitely precious, and worthy of all reverence and adoration. From these considerations, taken together, arises the obvious necessity for such directions as the following of the Romish Missal.

"If the celebrator, before consecration, observe that the host is corrupted, or is not of wheat, he must take another host; if after consecration, he must still take another and swallow it, after which, he must also swallow the first, or give it to another, or preserve it with reverence."

"If any remains of meat, sticking in the mouth, be swallowed with the host, they do not prevent communicating, provided they be swallowed not as meat, but as spittle. The same is to be said, if in washing the mouth, a drop of water be swallowed, provided it be against our will."

"If a gnat or spider fall into the cup, after consecration, the priest must swallow it with the blood, if he can; otherwise, let him take it out, wash

it with wine, burn it, and throw it with the washings on holy ground. If poison fall into the cup, the blood must be poured on tow or on a linen cloth, remain till it be dry, then be burnt, and the ashes be thrown upon holy ground. If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted."

"If any of Christ's blood fall upon the ground by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue and the place scraped; the scrapings must be burnt, and the ashes buried in holy ground."

"If the priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, it must be licked up most reverently. If a nausea prevent that to be done, it must be kept till it be corrupted. If the species do not appear entire, let the vomit be burnt and the ashes thrown upon holy ground."<sup>1</sup>

Popery makes a fair shew with its magnificent cathedrals, its gorgeous vestments, its imposing ceremonies, its shrines, its altars, its incense, its music, its pretences of antiquity, and unity, and catholicity. But what a contrast is here! Or rather, what a revelation of the hidden loathsomeness, the meanness, and the degradation which are its most essential characteristics!

There are those in our time who speak lightly of doctrines and doctrinal differences, who are accustomed to talk of Christianity as not being a doctrine, but a life, and who would seek a higher elevation and a purer atmosphere of religion by emancipation from the creeds and the confessions and the hard and rigid rules which have prevailed in the Church. Let them look here and see the importance of doctrinal truth or doctrinal error, in these legitimate consequences, for they are legitimate consequences, of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

But the forms and ceremonies connected with the saying of mass are too interesting and important a subject to be so hastily passed over. I prefer to seek them in books intended for the people rather than in the books intended solely for the priests. Bishop Challoner devotes to this subject a considerable portion of his work entitled *The Catholic Christian Instructed*, giving minute directions, which he evidently deemed important,—as

<sup>1</sup> See M'Gavin, Protestant, No. lxxvii.



we also must, though for a different reason. It is well that we should thus look a little further into the interior of Popery than the mere Popish controversial works enable us to do, and behold the trifling and drivelling, and the multitudinous abominations which abound in the place where we are required to expect all that is awful and venerable, majestic and holy. It is impossible to quote all, but I shall proceed to give considerable extracts from the work of Bishop Challoner just referred to, illustrating them by reference to other publications. Not being so much intended for heretical eyes, this work, and others of the same class, contain many things to which controversialists like Dr Milner, Dr Wiseman, and Mr Keenan, make no allusion in their controversial works, but which we must take into account in order that we may obtain a proper view of the Popery that exists beside us, and so urgently demands our favourable regard.

It may be well to begin by stating that the Papist is required to go to mass in the same disposition of soul in which he would have been present at the sacrifice of the cross.

"They ought to go as if they were going to Mount Calvary, to be present at the passion and death of the Redeemer, since the mass is indeed the same sacrifice as that which he there offered."<sup>1</sup>

The information contained in the following extract is probably new to some readers, and cannot fail to interest them, both as being curious in itself and because of the light which it casts on Popery. It is an answer to the question, "What is the meaning of the priest's vestments?"

"The priest, in saying mass, represents the person of Christ, who is the high priest of the new law; and the mass itself represents his passion; and therefore the priest puts on these vestments to represent those with which Christ was ignominiously clothed at the time of his passion. Thus, for instance, the amice represents the rag or clout with which the Jews muffled our Saviour's face, when at every blow they bid him prophesy who it was that struck him, *St Luke*, xxii. 64; the alb represents the white garment with which he was invested by Herod; the girdle, maniple, and stole, represent the cords and bands with which he was bound in the differ-

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *Cath. Christ. Instr.*, ch. vii.

ent stages of his passion; the chasuble or outward vestment represents the purple garment with which he was clothed as a mock king; upon the back of which there is a cross to represent that which Christ bore on his sacred shoulders; *lastly*, the priest's tonsure or crown is to represent the crown of thorns which our Saviour wore. Moreover, as in the old law, the priests who were to officiate in sacred functions, had, by the appointment of God, vestments assigned for that purpose, as well for the greater decency and solemnity of the divine worship, as to signify and represent the virtues which God required of his ministers; so it was proper, that in the Church of the New Testament, Christ's ministers should, in their sacred functions, be distinguished from the laity by their sacred vestments; which might also represent the virtues which God requires in them; thus the amice, which is first put upon the hand, represents divine hope, which the apostle calls the helmet of salvation; the alb, innocence of life; the girdle, with which the loins are begirt, purity and chastity; the maniple, which is put on the left arm, patiently suffering the labours of this mortal life; the stole, the sweet yoke of Christ to be borne in this life in order to a happy immortality in the next; in fine, the chasuble, which as uppermost, covers all the rest, the virtue of charity."<sup>1</sup>

Enough of this theatrical foolery. What has it to do with the religion of Jesus Christ, or with the worship of that God who is a Spirit, and whom they that worship must worship in spirit and in truth?

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*. The same, or nearly, may be found in the *Key of Heaven*, near the end. See also "Explanation of the Construction, Furniture, and Ornaments of a Church, of the Vestments of the Clergy, and the Nature and Ceremonies of the Mass. By the late Right Rev. John England, D.D., Bishop of Charleston, U. S. A." (Rome 1850)—where the origin and history of these priestly garments is traced with considerable learning. But, says Dr England, "As the sufferings of the Redeemer became the great subject of the Christians' meditation, the Church sought to turn every object which presented itself to the observation of her children, especially in the temples, to their profit. She therefore gave to everything used in the sacred edifice a mysterious signification. She told the observers that when they beheld the clergyman, who was the minister of the Saviour, with his amict on his head, it should be to them the occasion of recollecting how, for the salvation of the human race, he who for us became the outcast of his nation, was blindfolded," &c.—(p. 17.) The same grave divine informs us that the mystic reason why the altar is made of stone, "is that the altar itself should represent Christ, who is the rock of salvation," &c.—(p. 13.) But this may be found also in many other authors.



But the Popish prelate is not satisfied, and so he goes on to inform his readers concerning five different colours in these vestments, and concerning the different days or occasions to which these five different colours are respectively adapted, the colours being white, red, green, violet, and black. He then explains why there is "always a crucifix upon the altar at the time of mass," and then, "what is the meaning of having lighted candles upon the altar at the time of mass." Some readers remembering the inclinations of the Puseyites, may perhaps wish to understand the mystery of the lighted candles,—which are intended—

"1st, To honour the triumph of our king, which is there celebrated by these lights, which are tokens of our joy and of his glory. 2dly, To denote the light of faith with which we are to approach him."<sup>1</sup>

Instruction is then given as to the reason "of making a reverence to the altar;" and the use of incense is explained. And by and bye, we come to "the different parts of the mass, and the ceremonies thereof." And here an extract must again be made:—

"Tell me now, if you please, the different parts of the mass, and the ceremonies thereof, that I may be the better instructed in this heavenly sacrifice?"

"1st, The priest, standing at the foot of the altar, having made a low reverence, begins with the sign of the cross, saying, 'In nomine Patris, &c. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;'" [but he says it all in Latin] "and then he recites, alternately with the clerk, the 42d Psalm, 'Judica me Deus, &c. Judge me, O God,' &c., composed by David in the time that he was persecuted by Saul, and kept at a distance from the tabernacle or temple of God, and expressing his ardent desires," . . . &c.

"2dly, The priest, bowing down at the foot of the altar, says the Confiteor, or General Confession, acknowledging his sins to God, to the whole court of heaven, and to all the faithful there assembled, begging their prayers to God for him; and the clerk repeats the same in name of the people," &c.<sup>2</sup>

Here Dr Challoner briefly defends his religion against the

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

objection of its adversaries that this confession of sins to the saints, or as he gracefully expresses it, "to the whole court of heaven," is idolatrously to give the saints an honour that belongs to God alone. His reply is, that

"The confessing our sins to any one, so far from being an honour peculiar to God, is what we are directed in Scripture to do to one another, *St James* v. 16. And accordingly, in this very form, which we call the Confiteor, we not only confess our sins to God and to his saints, but the priest also confesses to the people, and the people to the priest."<sup>1</sup>

But confessing to one another, and confessing to God, have entirely different objects, and can never be combined in one act, without the most grievous confusion. We confess to God in order to obtain his forgiveness; we confess to our fellow-men in order to obtain the benefit of their counsel and prayers. To say nothing of the want of any warrant for addressing ourselves in this manner to saints in heaven; yet if this be done in the same act and breath with our confession of sins to God, the very nature of the act is changed, and confession to the saints and confession to God are identified.

Dr James Butler's Catechism contains the Confiteor, in Latin, in the form used in the saying of mass, with a stage direction in English:—

" . . . quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, verbo, et opere, (*strike your breast thrice, and say*) mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa: . . ."<sup>2</sup>

But to return to Dr Challoner; and passing over certain directions all in the same theatrical fashion about the priest going up to the altar and praying as he goes, and kissing the altar, and going to the book and reading the *Introit*, and so forth, we come to the following injunction of vain repetitions after the manner of the heathen:—

"4thly, He returns to the middle of the altar and says, alternately with

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> See the Manner of Serving at Mass, at the end of Dr James Butler's Catechism.



the clerk, the Kyrie Eleison, or Lord have mercy on us; which is said three times to God the Father; three times, Christe Eleison, or Christ have mercy upon us, to God the Son; and three times again, Kyrie Eleison, to God the Holy Ghost."<sup>1</sup>

This "frequent calling for mercy," we are told, teaches us the necessity of a penitential spirit, and of a contrite and humble heart; but if this were really the intention, why should unlearned Englishmen or Irishmen hear only Greek words? Besides, how far this part of the service is from all true solemnity, or from being calculated to produce salutary impressions in reasonable men, any one may judge for himself who reads it as it is set down in Dr Butler's Catechism, or in any of the books which exhibit the ordinary of the mass. After some alternation of speech by the Priest and the Clerk, all of course in Latin, we have the following:—

"P. Domine, exaudi orationem meam.

C. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.

P. Dominus vobiscum.

C. Et cum spiritu tuo.

P. Kyrie eleison.

C. Kyrie eleison.

P. Kyrie eleison.

C. Christe eleison.

P. Christe eleison.

C. Christe eleison.

P. Kyrie eleison.

C. Kyrie eleison.

C. Kyrie eleison.

P. Dominus vobiscum, (on some days) Flectamus genia.

C. Et cum spiritu tuo, (on some days) Levate."<sup>2</sup>

And this is to the honour of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost! This is to awaken penitential feelings, and to teach the necessity of a humble and contrite heart! As we read it over, we seem to hear the alternate strumming of the

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Dr James Butler's Catechism, *ut supra*. See also the Key of Heaven, Husenbeth's Missal for the Laity, &c.

fiddles of an orchestra, before the performers are yet quite ready to begin their music.

We must pass over very much. The directions for this performance are so many and so minute, that the patience of the reader would be wearied, and the pages of this volume would be unduly occupied if they were all to be quoted.<sup>1</sup>

The reader will remark that we were at *4thly*; we pass now to *7thly*, which however is too interesting to be omitted. The first sentence will astonish those to whom it is new, and who are not aware of the Popish manner of ascribing spiritual significations to the pettiest acts connected with their worship, and thus exalting them into important parts of religion, by which great spiritual realities are sadly brought into contempt. And in the sentences following, they will find a number of things of the same nature, each more pitiful than the former.

"*7thly*, After the Epistle and Gradual, the book is removed to the other side of the altar, in order to read the Gospel of the day; *which removal of the book represents the passing from the preaching of the Old Law, figured by the Lesson or Epistle, to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, published by the preachers of the New Law.* The priest, before he reads the Gospel, makes his prayer, bowing down before the middle of the altar, that God would cleanse his heart and his lips, that he may be worthy to declare his gospel. At the beginning of the Gospel, both priest and people make the sign of the cross; 1st, Upon their foreheads, to signify that they will not be ashamed of Christ and his doctrine; 2dly, Upon their mouth, to signify that they will profess it in words; 3dly, Upon their breast, to signify that they will always keep it in their hearts. During the Gospel, the people stand, to show by this posture, their readiness to go and do whatsoever they shall be commanded by their Saviour in his divine word. At the end, the clerk answers, in the name of the people, 'Laus tibi Christe, Praise be to thee, O Christ,' to give praise to our Redeemer for his heavenly doctrine; and the priest kisses the book in reverence to those sacred words which he has been reading out of it. In the high or solemn mass, the Gospel is sung by the deacon, and

<sup>1</sup> When a bishop celebrates, Dr England tells us, "he wears gloves, at the putting on of which he prays that his iniquities might be hid from the face of the Lord, by the merits of the Saviour; so that like another Jacob, having his hands covered with the skins of kids," &c. &c. (Dr England's Explanation, 28.)



lighted candles are held by the acolytes on each side, to denote the light which Christ brought us by his Gospel."<sup>1</sup>

And the "heavenly doctrine," it will be observed, is locked up in Latin all the while; for, although in certain cases, the use of the vulgar tongue may be tolerated in other services, the Church of Rome has exercised what her children call a judicious care to guard from every innovation, the awful ritual of the mass.<sup>2</sup>

I pass over Dr Challoner's 8thly, which concludes with the taking off "the veil from the chalice, in order to proceed to the offering up the bread and wine in sacrifice." But here it may be well to quote a few stage directions for the clerk from Dr James Butler's Catechism.

"Here take the wine in your right hand, and the water in your left. When the priest advances towards you, bow respectfully. Having given the wine, put the water into your right hand, receive the wine-cruet in your left, and give the water to him. Then lay aside the wine, stand ready with the water in your right hand, to pour it on his fingers; after doing which, and leaving the water with the wine, go and kneel on the same side. Bow when you give or receive anything—at the name of Jesus,—at the beginning and end of the Gospel,—and whenever you pass by the middle of the altar. If the Holy Sacrament be in the tabernacle, make a profound genuflection."<sup>3</sup>

So minutely ordered is every motion, gesture, and grimace, in this sad performance. But we must now return to Bishop Challoner.

"9thly, He offers, first, the bread upon the paten or little plate; then pours the wine into the chalice, mingling it with a little water, and offers that up in like manner, *begging that this sacrifice may be accepted of by the Almighty for the remission of sins, for all there present, for all the faithful, living and dead, and for the salvation of all the world.* Then bowing down . . . &c. &c. Then he blesses the bread and wine with the sign of the cross, invoking the Holy Ghost, . . . &c. After this, he goes to the corner of the altar, and there washes the tips of his fingers, saying, 'Lavabo, &c. I will wash my hands among the innocent, and I will en-

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*. I have taken the liberty of putting a few words in italics and small capitals.

<sup>2</sup> Geraldine, I., 260.

<sup>3</sup> Dr James Butler's Cat., *ut supra*.

compass thy altar O Lord, &c., as in the latter part of the 25th Psalm. This washing of the fingers denote the cleanness and purity of the soul with which these divine mysteries are to be celebrated, which ought to be such, as not only to wash away all greater filth, but even the dust which sticks to the tips of our fingers, by which are signified the smallest faults and imperfections.

"10thly, After washing his fingers, the priest returns to the middle of the altar, and there bowing down, begs of the blessed Trinity to receive this oblation IN MEMORY of the passion, resurrection and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ; AND FOR AN HONOURABLE COMMEMORATION OF the blessed Virgin and of all the saints, that they may intercede for us in heaven." . . .

&c.

"11thly, Then the priest says in a low voice the prayers called the secreta, which correspond to the collects of the day, and are different every day."<sup>1</sup>

This saying prayers in a low voice seems to have acted strongly on the imagination of many of the Reformers, and to have awakened in them peculiar contempt. Accordingly, we find them speaking of the *mumbled mass*. Nor is it possible to read such an account as that with which we are now engaged, of the forms and ceremonies of this great part of Popish worship, without being ready to exclaim with Bishop Pilkington, one of the plainest and severest of the English bishops in the Elizabethan age, "How many toys, crossings, blessings, blowings, knockings, kneelings, bowings, liftings, sighings, housings, turnings, and half-turnings, mockings, mowings, sleepings, and apish playings, soft whisperings, and loud speakings have we to consecrate our own devices withal, or it can be gotten done!"<sup>2</sup>

After what has already been quoted, Bishop Challoner thus goes on with his directions:—

"He concludes by saying aloud, 'Per omnia sæcula sæculorum,' that is, 'World without end.' Ans., 'Amen.'"

But why the people should say Amen to these words does not appear, nor why they should be said at all, or, at least, why they should be said aloud, as they cannot be supposed to have

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Pilkington, Works, (Parker Society,) 498.



any meaning except as the conclusion of the priest's private or *mumbled* prayer. And why should the people say Amen to a prayer which they did not hear?

Passing over many things, we find, under this eleventh head, that the faithful humbly beg leave to have their voices admitted together with the choirs of angels "in that celestial hymn, 'Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus,' &c., i.e., 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts, the heavens and the earth are full of thy Glory.'" <sup>1</sup>

The hymn of course is in Latin, that being the language of the court of heaven, and the words are accompanied with bell-ringing, for which Dr James Butler gives the following directions to the clerk.

"When the Priest says *Sanctus* three times, ring the bell once at each time; when he spreads his hands over the chalice, warn the people by the bell of the consecration which is about to follow; when he kneels down before and after the elevation of the host and chalice, raise the chasuble, and notify what he is doing by the proper manner of ringing the bell." <sup>2</sup>

Under the next head, Bishop Challoner assigns the reasons, preposterous and not free from blasphemy, for that low whispering or mumbling, of which we have met with a little already, and now meet with more.

"12thly, After the preface follows the canon of the mass, the most sacred and solemn part of this divine service, which is read *with a low voice*, as well to *express the silence of Christ in his passion, and his concealing at that time his glory and his divinity, as to signify the vast importance of that common cause of all mankind, which THE PRIEST IS THEN REPRESENTING AS IT WERE A SECRET IN THE EAR OF GOD; and the reverence with which both priest and people ought to assist at these tremendous mysteries.*"

"Then the priest spreads his hands over the bread and wine which are to be consecrated into the body and blood of Christ, according to the ancient ceremony prescribed in the Levitical law, . . . &c. . . . Then he blesses the bread and wine, with the sign of the cross, . . . &c. Then he proceeds to the consecration: first of the bread into the body of our Lord, and then of the wine into his blood;

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.  
<sup>2</sup> Dr James Butler's Catechism, *ut supra*.

which consecration is made by the words of Christ, pronounced by the priest in his name, and bearing his person. This is the chief action of the mass, in which the very essence of this sacrifice consists; because, by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are really exhibited and presented to God, and Christ is mystically immolated." <sup>1</sup>

This nonsense astonishes me the more, every time I meet with it again. The separate consecration of the bread and the wine is somehow supposed to represent the separation of the blood from the body, and so to indicate death. Yet we are told that it is the glorified body of the living Saviour which is there present,—and we are told that the bread is whole Christ, as it is the glorified body of Christ, and the glorified body cannot be without blood,—and we are told that a whole Christ, body and blood, and bones and sinews, <sup>2</sup> and soul and divinity, is actually present in every particle and in every drop!

"Immediately after the consecration follows the elevation, first of the host, then of the chalice, *in remembrance of Christ's elevation upon the cross,*" [how like!] "*and that the people may adore their Lord veiled under these sacred signs.*" <sup>3</sup>

I forbear to quote much which follows, as about the Memento, or remembrance of the dead, and the striking of the breast,—for it seems that at certain parts of the service, the priest is required to strike his breast in token of repentance, *like the humble publican in the gospel*,—and about the kneeling down and making the sign of the cross with the *host* over the *chalice*, and the saying of the Paternoster, "*which is pronounced with a loud voice,*"—and the putting of a particle of the broken *host* into the chalice. But here indeed we come to what must not be omitted.

"This ceremony of mixing a particle of the host with the species of wine in the chalice, *represents the reuniting of Christ's body, blood, and soul at his resurrection.*" <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.  
<sup>2</sup> ". . . quicquid ad veram corporis rationem pertinet, veluti ossa et nervos. . . ." *Cat. Paroch.*  
<sup>3</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.  
<sup>4</sup> Ibid.



"14thly, Then follows the *Agnus Dei*, &c., which the priest pronounces three times, striking his breast in token of repentance.<sup>1</sup>

"After which, kneeling down, and then rising and taking up the blessed sacrament, he three times strikes his breast, saying '*Domine non sum dignus, &c.*—Lord I am not worthy thou shouldst enter under my roof, say thou only but the word and my soul shall be healed.'<sup>2</sup>

Bishop Challoner translates it for the information of the faithful, but it is all said in Latin; and the thought might have arisen that his own translation of the words in his book of instruction, was a virtual condemnation of the absurdity practised and vindicated by his Church.

But this saying, "*Domine non sum dignus, &c.*," is not only accompanied with theatrical action and grimace on the part of the priestly performer, but likewise, as we learn from the Most Reverend Dr James Butler, with a pantomimic accompaniment by the clerk.

"At the *Domine non sum dignus*, *ring* THRICE, and ONCE when the priest receives the chalice; hasten then to have the wine and water ready for the ablution of the chalice. Immediately afterward, remove the book, and kneel on the other side opposite to it."<sup>3</sup>

This brings us to the *ablutions*, not the least interesting part of the whole ceremony. In what follows, the reader will trace the legitimate consequences of the doctrine of transubstantiation; whilst he must be shocked and disgusted, and his soul grieved by the association of such pitiful meanness with the holy things of Christ's religion.—Dr Challoner says,

"15thly, After the communion, the priest takes first a little wine into the chalice, which is called the first ablution, in order to consume what remains of the consecrated species in the chalice; and then takes a little wine and water, which is called the second ablution, upon his fingers over the chalice, *to the end that no particle of the blessed sacrament may remain sticking to his fingers, but that all may be washed into the chalice and be so received.*"<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

<sup>3</sup> Butler's Catechism, *ut supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*.

But all this is surpassed by the directions to priest and people as to the administering and receiving of the sacrament:—

"After the communion of the priest in the mass, such of the people as are to communicate go up to the rails before the altar and there kneel down, *and taking the towel, hold it before their breasts in such a manner that if in communicating it should happen that any particle would fall, it may not fall to the ground, but be received upon the towel.*"<sup>1</sup>

"What else is required of a person that is to receive the blessed sacrament?

"He must be fasting, at least, from midnight; for so the Church commands, agreeably to a most ancient and apostolical tradition: *so that if through inadvertence a person has taken anything, though it were no more than one drop or crumb, after twelve o'clock at night, he must by no means receive that day, as it would be a crime to attempt it.*"<sup>1</sup>

Such is the yoke which the Man of Sin has ventured to impose. Here we may for a moment turn to Peter Dens, who gives still fuller information, and condescends to the most amazing particulars. If a person take medicine, he says, or if even by accident he swallows such non-nutritive substances as paper, earth, coals, wood, or chalk, his fast is broken,—although it is not broken if he only put a thing to his tongue to taste it and immediately spit it out, without letting it go into his stomach,—but it is broken, and for all this the high authority of *St Thomas* is quoted, if he pick his teeth with a pen, or even remove any particles from them with his tongue, and do not spit it out but swallow it.—The reader must excuse these things, for without them I cannot so fully shew him what sort of religion it is which builds grand cathedrals in our towns, and sends forth Cardinal Wiseman and Bishop Gillis as its representatives to plead its cause before the people of this country.—The fast is broken, moreover, if sugar melted in the mouth is swallowed with the spittle; because, it is gravely added, the act is not to be regarded as the swallowing of the spittle but of the principal thing, to wit the sugar. Even a drop of water intentionally

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, Cath. Chr. Inst., ch. v., sect. 7. Such directions may be found also in other most approved Popish manuals.



drawn in by the breath is sufficient to break this fast, or blood from a wounded finger, if a man happen to put it to his mouth. But if a drop of water get in during the washing of the face, it is not attended with the same serious consequences.

Here, however, a great question arises, and Peter Dens gives a whole chapter to it, which must often be perused with great interest at Maynooth, whether the taking of tobacco breaks this natural fast—" *utrum sumptio tabaci frangat jejunium naturale*,"—(the Latin sounds better than English);—and the chapter is divided into three sections; "I. *De tabaco nasali*; II. *Fumigato*; III. *Et Masticato*;"—Concerning nasal tobacco, *i.e.*, snuff, concerning smoking, and concerning chewing. "*Si sit sermo de tabaco nasali*," Peter begins—but I shall neither quote the sentence nor present his arguments; only it may be mentioned that he decides clearly in favour of snuff, leaves the question undecided as to smoking, and finds still greater difficulty as to chewing, in which he is no worse than Pope Benedict XIV., whose infallibility it seems was not applied to the determination of the controversy, in which Pontas and Billuart are ranged upon one side, and Van Roy sustains a prominent position on the other.<sup>1</sup> All which questions, with many more not merely contemptible and disgusting like these, but full of absolute indecency, may be found still more fully treated by St Alphonsus Liguori, in his Moral Theology.<sup>2</sup> I refrain, after the example of Protestant writers in general, from quoting even for the purposes of controversy, those things which are indecent, although I deem it not improbable that it may soon be found necessary to adopt some other method than has yet been done of making the Protestant public acquainted with this feature of Popery. But, without further comment, I must now give one other still more illustrative extract from the popular manual of Bishop Challoner:—

"What ought to be a Christian's behaviour at the time of receiving this blessed sacrament?"

<sup>1</sup> Dens, Theol., V., 302-304.

<sup>2</sup> Liguori, Theol. Moral., IV., 65-68.

"As to the interior, he ought to have his soul at that time full of the sentiments we have just now mentioned, of faith, love, and humility; and as to the exterior comportment, he ought to have his head erect, his eyes modestly cast down, his mouth moderately open, and his tongue a little advanced on his under lip, that the priest may conveniently put the sacred host on his tongue, which he must gently convey into his mouth, and after having moistened it for a moment or two on his tongue, swallow it as soon as he can. In all which he is carefully to avoid, 1st, The putting his mouth to the towel; 2dly, The chewing with his teeth, or raising the host to the roof of his mouth; 3dly, The letting the sacred particles quite dissolve in his mouth; 4thly, THE SPITTING SOON AFTER COMMUNION. But SHOULD THE PARTICLES HAPPEN TO STICK TO THE ROOF OF HIS MOUTH, let him not be disturbed, NOR PUT HIS FINGER INTO HIS MOUTH TO REMOVE IT, but gently remove it with his tongue as soon as he can, and so convey it down."<sup>1</sup>

It follows very necessarily from the doctrine of transubstantiation that Papists should make some provision against unseemly accidents to their idol—their alleged Christ with the sensible qualities of bread or wine. "If the consecrated host," says the Roman missal, "should disappear by any accident, as being taken away by the wind, OR A MIRACLE, OR A MOUSE, OR any other animal, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated, and let the animal be taken if possible, and killed, and his ashes cast into a consecrated place, or under the altar." In the same venerated book it is also written, "If the celebrator, before consecration, observes that the host is corrupted, or is not of wheat, he must take another host; if after consecration, he must still take another and swallow it; after which, he must also swallow the first, or give it to another, or preserve it with reverence." And again, "If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted."

But is it not amazing that notwithstanding all this, a priest of the Church of Rome should venture to write as Mr Keenan

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *ut supra*. See also Dens and Liguori, *ut supra*. I give one sentence from Liguori:—" *Omnes conveniunt congruum quidem esse, ut communicantes per aliquod temporis intervallum abstineant ab expuendo: dicunt tamen Holzm., t. 1, de jejun. p. 351, n. 76. Wigandt tr. 12. n. 45. et Croix l. 6. p. 1. n. 549. nullum esse peccatum expuere post communionem, si nullum hostie fragmentum remanserit in ore.*"—(IV. 80.)



does :—"The Protestant sacrament is corruptible at all times : . . . The Protestant sacrament has the taste of ordinary bread?"<sup>1</sup> What taste has *his* sacrament, especially after it is corrupted? But it is his Christ—his God—and he worships it!

And what becomes of that which Papists eat and drink, affirming it to be the body, and blood, and soul, and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ? And what effects has it on their animal constitution? Bishop Challoner has evidently thought of this, and though his answer is not very clear, it is fair to give it. It seems that a new miracle accompanies the ordinary process of digestion, which of course only occupies itself with the accidents.

"This sacrament was not ordained for the nourishment of the body, but of the soul, though I do not deny but the body is also nourished when we receive the blessed eucharist; not by the substance of the bread and wine, which is not there, nor by the body and blood of Christ, which is incorruptible, and therefore cannot be digested for our corporal nourishment; but by the quantity and other accidents of the bread and wine (if, with the Aristotelian philosophers you suppose them really distinguished from matter and substance) or by another substance which the Almighty substitutes, when by the ordinary course of digestion the sacramental species are changed and the body and blood of Christ cease to be there."<sup>2</sup>

It is hard to tell whether absurdity or blasphemy prevails most in the above paragraph. The idle prating about quantity and other accidents,—the refuge sought in the thick fogs of the Aristotelian philosophy,—the readiness to call in the Almighty, if necessary, as the worker of an imaginary miracle, (just such an expedient as might be suggested by a waggish adversary to a controversialist entangled in inextricable difficulties,)—all are strikingly characteristic of that system of error which has not only enwrapped in midnight darkness the soul of man that seeks the light of truth, the knowledge of God, and the way to heaven, but has spread its dull shadows over the fair fields of science and philosophy, has incapacitated the minds of multi-

<sup>1</sup> Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xxiv., sect. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Challoner, Cath. Chr. Instr., ch. v., sect. 4.

tudes for expatiating in them with any success or satisfaction, and can no more consist with the developement of ordinary human knowledge than the Hinduism which incorporates with itself false systems of geography and astronomy. Yet such is the instruction which our British Papists receive from the books they are most commonly in the habit of perusing.

But, perhaps, what places this whole subject before the mind in its most striking aspect, is the question as to the case of the mouse eating the sacrament, to which allusion is specially made in the enumeration of possible accidents in the Roman missal as above quoted. It is a question which has not only been proposed by Protestants, but with which Papists themselves in the old days of scholastic disputation were accustomed to exercise their faculties.—*Quid comedit mus?* What eateth the mouse?—The reader must perceive at a glance the horrible import of the question.

Bishop Jewel has been at pains to collect the opinions of great Popish theologians on this great question. "Yet notwithstanding," says he, "I must confess beforehand, that the speeches that they have used on this behalf, are so blasphemous and vile, that for the reverence I bear to the glorious body of Christ, I can neither hear them nor utter them without horror."<sup>1</sup> I shall give one or two of the Popish opinions, with Jewel's translation and notes. A few specimens are perhaps enough for the present purpose.

"First of all, Thomas of Aquine saith thus :—*Quidam . . . dixerunt, quod, cum primum sacramentum sumitur a mure vel a cane, desinit esse corpus et sanguis Christi: sed hoc derogat veritati hujus sacramenti:* 'Some have said, that as soon as the sacrament is touched by a mouse or a dog, the body and blood of Christ straightway departeth from it. But this is a derogation to the truth of this sacrament.' . . . M. Harding may not well call in question whether this doctor were Catholic or no. For Christ said unto him in a vision in his dream : *Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma:* 'O Thomas, thou hast written full well of me.' And therefore he is called

<sup>1</sup> Jewel, Works, II. 782. (Parker Society.) In the controversy with Harding, in the "Reply to M. Harding's Answer."



*doctor angelicus*, 'an angelical doctor,' for that in learning and judgment, he so far surmounted all other doctors, and was accounted most catholic.

"Johannes de Burgo saith: *Mus . . . comedens hostiam suscipit corpus Christi*: 'The mouse, eating the sacrament, receiveth the body of Christ.'

"Alexander de Hales . . . saith: *Si canis vel porcus deglutiret hostiam consecratam integram, non video, quare corpus Domini non simul traheretur in ventrem canis vel porci*: 'If a dog or a swine should eat the whole host, being consecrate, I see no cause but our Lord's body should enter into the belly of the dog or of the swine.'"

From this it would appear that Alexander de Hales did not fully understand what we have seen that the Council of Trent, however, so distinctly declares, that every separate particle of the host becomes what the whole host was originally alleged to be. But this is only noticed in passing, as an illustration of the diversities of Popish theology, and is not otherwise worthy of notice at all.

I proceed a little further with the quotation from Jewel,—

"Peter Lombard, the master of all Catholic conclusions, one that taketh upon him to teach all others, when he cometh to this point, he standeth in aammering, and is not able to teach himself. For thus he saith touching the same: *Quid igitur sumit mus, vel quid manducat?* 'WHAT IS IT THEN THAT THE MOUSE RECEIVETH, OR WHAT EATETH IT?' He answereth: *Deus novit*; 'GOD KNOWETH; I KNOW IT NOT.'

"Notwithstanding, his resolution is this: *Sane dici potest, quod corpus Christi a brutis animalibus non sumitur*: 'It may very well be said, that a brute beast receiveth not the body of Christ.' But this sentence is reversed, and not thought Catholic. For the great faculty of Paris hath given this judgment upon the same, *Hic magister non tenetur*: 'Herein the master is not allowed.'

"Touching such cases as herein may happen, Antoninus, the Archbishop of Florence, writeth thus: *Si mus, aut aliud animal, &c.*:—'If a mouse or any other worm or beast happen to eat the sacrament through negligence of keeping, let the keeper through whose negligence it happened be enjoined to penance forty days. And, if it be possible, let the mouse be taken and burnt, and let his ashes be buried in or about the altar. But Peter of Palus saith: The mouse's entrails must be drawn, and the

portion of the sacrament that there remaineth, if the priest be squeamish to receive it, must reverently be laid up in the tabernacle, until it may naturally be consumed. But the host so found in the mouse's entrails may in no wise be thrown out into the pool, as a certain priest sometime used a fly that he found in his chalice after consecration. But if a man had such a fervent zeal, saith he, that his stomach would serve him to receive the same without horror, there were no way to it,<sup>1</sup> specially if the man were fasting. So St Hugh of Clunice much commendeth Goderanus, a priest, for receiving the like portions cast up again by a leper. But he said afterwards, St Laurence's gridiron was nothing so bad.<sup>2</sup> Hitherto Antoninus.

"And for more likelihood hereof, this is holden as a Catholic conclusion of that side [*Corpus Christi*] *potest evomi*. 'The very body of Christ may be vomited up again.'"

"I protest again, as before," adds Jewel, "the very blasphemy and loathsomeness hereof unto a godly heart is intolerable. Neither would I have used this unpleasant rehearsal, were it not that it behoveth each man to know how deeply the people hath been deceived, and to what villainy they have been brought."

"These be the imps of transubstantiation," says he afterwards.<sup>2</sup>

Let the reader ponder the specimens of Popery which have been presented to him. Let him consider the dignity, the purity, the spirituality of this religion. Let him consider the rules with which he almost feels it a sort of degradation of his mind to occupy his thoughts for a few moments, but which are pretended to be part and parcel of Christianity. And when his whole soul is filled with wonder, and pity, and contempt, and abhorrence,—when he has before him in clear view the trickery of these theatrical performances,—the vileness and degradation that are hidden behind the dazzling and imposing ceremonial,—the thralldom of wretches labouring to adjust their heads, and mouths, and tongues, as ancles are twisted and toes are set at the bidding of a dancing-master, and torturing their consciences because of some particle of food which by accident has got into their stomachs since midnight, or some portion of the idol wafer

<sup>1</sup> Latin original, as given in a foot-note, *commendandus esset*.

<sup>2</sup> Jewel, Works, II., 783, 784. (Parker Society.)



which has stuck amongst their teeth, and in removing which they fear to dishonour Christ,—when he has all this before him, he will surely be ready to pray with much earnestness even for the fulfilment of the most terrible predictions concerning the destruction of the Man of Sin, and the overthrow of the spiritual Babylon.